JÑĀNĀMṚTAM



PROFESSOR A.C. SWAIN FELICITATION VOLUME

JÑĀNĀMṚTAM

PROFESSOR A. C. SWAIN FELICITATION VOLUME

(Essays in Contemporary Indological Research)

Edited by

Dr. U. N. Dhal
Prof. R. M. Dash

P. G. DEPARTMENT OF SANSKRIT
UTKAL UNIVERSITY, VANIVIHAR
BHUBANESWAR-751004
ORISSA

Published by :

Prof. R. M. Dash, Convener,
Old Students' Association,
P. G. Deptt. of Sanskrit,
Utkal University,
Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar-751004,
Orissa (India).
(*With the financial assistance from students of the P.G. Deptt. of Sanskrit, Utkal University—old and new*)

Books can also be had from :

Dr. U. N. Dhal, Reader,
P. G. Deptt. of Sanskrit,
Utkal University, Vani Vihar,
Bhubaneswar-751004

First Published : 1985

Price : Rs. 180/-

Printed at—

Shaila Printings and
Book Binding,
Friends' Colony,
Bajrakabati Road,
Cuttack-753001
Orissa (India)

CONTENTS

PART : ONE

PART : TWO

PART - I

Gram : UTKALVIHAR

Phones
Off. Main 52850
Off. 52520 Extn-1
Res. Main 53354
Res. 52520 Extn-3

Dr. M. N. Das,
VICE - CHANCELLOR



UTKAL UNIVERSITY
VANIVIHAR
BHUBANESWAR

MESSAGE

Prof. Anam Charan Swain has been one of the most eminent teachers of Utkal University for a full generation now. His services to the Department of Sanskrit in particular and to Utkal University in general, will be remembered by his grateful colleagues friends and students for long long time to come. He gave his extreme devotion to the cause of higher learning and to the promotion of researches in Sanskrit. As a man, he has proved himself ideal by virtue of his manifold qualities. One may say that all are his friends and no one is his enemy. He has loved all and has been loved by all. By his dedication to the cause of learning, he has earned reputation all over India and has earned pride and prestige for his Alma mater.

Those of his friends and disciples who have endeavoured to perpetuate his memory deserve our grateful thanks. Such a noble soul, as Prof. Swain is, his memory will last in the mind of all who know him intimately. The felicitation volume will highlight several aspects of his personality and his achievements even though no volume can be exhaustive enough to focus the merit of such an eminent scholar. I wish the organisers a grand success and I pray for many more years of life for Prof. Swain in health and happines and in purposive pursuit of learning.

M. N. Das
15-1-85

PREFACE

With a sense of extreme gratification we set out to serve this "Nectar of knowledge" to the scholars, by way of *Prasāda*, which has first been offered to Prof. A. C. SWAIN as *Naivedya*. Such a kind of intellectual *Naivedya* is, indeed, a befitting present, the best item to be offered, to a *Kulaguru*, who has kindled the torch of knowledge in the hearts of at least two successive generations of scholars. We hope that this वाङ्मयी पूजा would be acceptable to the saint-like person of Prof. SWAIN though we know fully well that one can never repay the debts of a true Guru—

pṛthivyāṁ nāsti tad dravyam
yad dattvā tv anṛṇī bhavet |

The articles collected in this Felicitation Volume and contributed by the colleagues, friends, pupils and admirers of Prof. SWAIN, cover a vast field of Indological studies and represents a cross-section of the present day trends in Sanskrit research. Coming from the pens of erudite and renowned scholars, they shall not only retain their value for a long time to come but shall also influence further research in their respective fields. There are 30 articles in all. Is it not on *Paurṇamāsī*, recurring after every 30 days, that the Moon is filled upto its brim with nectar for the gods to enjoy ? With a deep sense of gratitude we tender our sincere thanks to the learned scholars who have quickly responded to our request and have readily contributed their scholarly articles for this volume.

Prof. SWAIN is a combination of the best of the East and the West. On the one hand he has studied Sanskrit in Kashi at the Benaras Hindu University under such stalwarts as Prof. P. L. VAIDYA and Prof. Baladeva UPADHYAYA and on the other, he has received training in modern research at Harvard from such illustrious personalities as Prof. INGALLS. He is not only an enthusiastic teacher, loving and affectionate towards

his students but also a meticulous and thorough research worker. We have tried our best to be thorough and accurate in the job of editing and printing this volume but we have perhaps not been able to surmount all our short-comings. We crave the indulgence of the scholars for our imperfections : *errare humanum est.*

We hope that this volume which is dedicated with utmost humility and regard at the feet of Prof. SWAIN on the occasion of his सौप्रास्थानिक पर्व will give him the satisfaction of having lived a fulfilled and successful academic life which has been a source of inspiration to many in and outside Orissa, the contributions of some of whom are included in this volume

May Prof. SWAIN be pleased with this 'वाक्यपुष्पोपहार', and may the Allmighty bestow upon him a life of hundred years.

THE EDITORS

EDITORIAL

On this auspicious occasion of the completion of the 60th year of Dr. A. C. Swain, Professor & Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Utkal University, Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar, We present this volume containing research papers from his students, friends, and well-wishers in India and abroad. These cover a wide range of study like Indian philosophy, poetics, classical literature, Grammar, Technical literature, Vedic and Puraṇic religion, History etc. The contributions represent the intensive research carried on in their respective field of specialisation.

We took up this noble venture within a very short period without any financial commitment from any source whatsoever. With heart within and god over head we could overcome several impediments to complete the work in due time. And the work could be so much possible due to the voluntary financial contribution of his students—old and new. The collection of funds made so far though meagre in comparision to the vast amount required could carry us so far for such a noble cause.

We beg to say that we have not been successful to tide over all the difficulties mainly financial and printing, which stood on our way. In the place of the proper diacritical types for capital 'ऋ' and small 'ङ' the types '*R*' and '*n*' have respectively been used, and the *anusvāra* (*ṁ*) has been used in the place of *parasavarṇa* 'ङ' throughout, for which we crave the indulgence of the esteemed readers.

We will be failing in our duties if we do not express our deep sense of gratitude to Dr. M. N. Das, our beloved Vice-Chancellor, Utkal University who has shown his interest in extending his help in this '*Pūjya-pūjā*', and has encouraged us althrough.

We are thankful to Prof. G. K. Das, Prof. R. N. Panda, Prof. S. Jena, Prof. C. Satapathy, and Prof. B. Parida who have helped us in various ways to make this attempt a success.

Lastly our thanks are due to Mrs. S. Mishra, proprietres, Shaila Printings and Book Binding, Cuttack, and her associates for their kind co-operation and prompt action but for which the work could not have seen the light of the day so soon.

Editors
Dr. U. N. Dhal
Shri R. M. Dash



Professor ANAM CHARAN SWAIN

सौजन्ये विनये नये प्रवचने निर्देशने पाठने
पाण्डित्ये प्रणये समस्तविदुषामाद्ये च संशोभते।
निष्ठा-सत्य विवेक-धैर्य-करुणा-मैत्रीगुणालङ्कृतः
दाक्षिण्येऽपि भवादृशो गुणिगुणग्राही न संदृश्यते॥

इच्छा सज्जनसंगमे परगुणे श्रद्धा गुरौ नम्रता
विद्यायां व्यसनं सुमिष्टकथनं भक्तिश्च नारायणे।
शत्रौ क्षान्तिगुणः परोपकरणं मित्रस्य सम्भाषणं
येष्वेते निवसन्ति निर्मलगुणास्तेभ्यो गुरुभ्यो नमः॥

योऽयं नीलाद्रिकन्दे प्रकटितविजयः प्राणिनां दुःखहारी
सर्वात्मा सर्वशक्तिः सकलगुणमयोऽप्यद्वयस्तत्त्वदृष्ट्या।
तस्य श्रीदारुमूर्त्तेः परमकरुणया धौतसर्वान्तरङ्गाः
आचार्याः सर्वभावैः प्रगुणितविभवाः शान्तिमेवाधियन्तु॥

I

PROF. ANAM CHARAN SWAIN : A PROFILE

Prof. Anam Charan Swain hails from an affluent land owner's family of Byree in Cuttack district of Orissa. He had his early education in his native village. To seek higher education, he left for Cuttack in Orissa, and has never looked back since. He passed out his post-graduation from Benares Hindu University in U.P. His further penchant for knowledge landed him in Harvard in the U. S A., where he successfully completed his A.M. and Ph.D.

Throughout his student career he has proved to be a student par excellence, and came out in flying colours time and again. His sincerity and devotion to study brought for him love and admiration from his teachers and elders. He fondly remembers his teachers even now and tries to cast himself in their mould. To his good fortune he came across teachers like Prof. Baladev Upadhyaya, Prof. Govinda Gopal Mukhopadhyaya, and Prof. D.H.H. Ingalls The immense influence that his teachers cast on him shaped his future career as a teacher and scholar. It was Prof. Upadhyaya who opened the door to him to the rich treasure house of Indian religion, culture, and literature. Prof. Mukhopadhyaya pointed to him the immense possibility in Indian philosophy. In Harvard he met Prof. Ingalls of international repute under whose able guidance, active inspiration, and parental affection, he passed through the ordeals of completing his A.M. degree in comparative religion and Ph.D. in Vedānta philosophy. The earlier gurus acted as catalysts in his blossoming as a great scholar. It is to the credit of Prof. Ingalls who with his deeper insight and scholastic endeavour extracted the best out of Prof. Swain, and shaped his destiny to a greater extent. Among his numerous friends and relatives he came across Prof. Suryakanta Das, faculty of Commerce during the early period of his career, and then association continues even now. Prof. Das served as a 'friend, philosopher and guide' to him, and exerted his influence in his pursuit of knowledge. The impact of Prof. Das on Prof. Swain's life is simply incomparable.

Coming in contact with various parts of the globe directly or indirectly, he imbibed everything best in oriental and occidental. Though a westerner in outlook he is distinctly an Indian in his manners and habits. Even his pre-eminence as a scholar lies in his harmoniously blending the Eastern and Western approach to study with a distinct vision of his own.

He is a hard working man. Whether in organizing a seminar, or guiding a research scholar, or himself in scholastic pursuit, this quality predominates. Despite his pre-occupation with the departmental and domestic activities he makes time for his own study.

As a man of ideal character he made the principle 'Life is Duty, Duty is life' a way of his life. He is well known for his punctuality, wisdom, intellect, sincerity, and dedication to the cause of learning. He takes pleasure to appreciate sincerity, honesty, and devotion wheresoever they are found. He is well versed in Indian Philosophy, comparative Religion and culture, and Sanskrit literature. It is a pleasure to hear from Prof. Swain the critical and comparative analysis of Indian religious concepts on different occasions.

II

LIST OF IMPORTANT PUBLICATIONS

Critical edition of *Kośalānanda Mahākāvya* (In press)

"Saundarānanda", (Oriya) *Jhaṁkāra*, Cuttack, Vol.III, No.12, March, 1952.

"Vaidika Āryara Dharmadhāraṇā", (Oriya) *Jhaṁkāra*, Cuttack, Vol.IV, No.3.

"Namo Gaṇeśa Vighneśa", (Oriya) *Jhaṁkāra*, Cuttack, Vol. IV, No.7, October, 1952.

"Maunavrata", (Oriya) *Jhaṁkāra*, Cuttack, Vol. IV. No. 9, December, 1952.

"Sarpapūjā", (Oriya) *Jhaṁkāra*, Cuttack, Vol. IV , No. II, February, 1953.

"Bauddhadharma prasārare Buddhaṁka vyaktitva", (Oriya) *Jhaṁkāra*, Vol.IV,No.12, March, 1953.

"Authenticity of the Bhagavad Gitā Bhāṣya attributed to Śaṁkarācārya", *The Mysore Orientalist*, Vol.II,No.1.

"Concept of Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī in the later Upaniṣads", *Bhāratī*, Vol.III, No.1, Bhubaneswar,1969.

"Concept of Haṁsa in the Upaniṣadic literature", *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, Vol.XIX, No.3.

"Śaṁkara's attitude towards the accounts of creation", *The Vedānta Keśarī*, Madras, Vol.LVI, No.5.

"Concept of Hiraṇyagarbha in the Philosophy of Śaṁkara," *Rājeśvara Śāstri Dravida Felicitation Volume*, Allahabad.

"Prahlāda ścāsmi daityānām", *Prof. P. Pradhan Felicitation Volume*, Bhubaneswar,1970.

"Man-lion myth in the Epics and Purāṇas", *Indian Antiquary*, Vol.V,No.1.

"Concept of Smaraṇa : Its origin and Development", Publication of the P.G.Department of Sanskrit, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar, 1970.

"Alakṣmī : A Stydy"—Publication of the P. G. Department of Sanskrit, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar,1970.

"The concept of creation according to Upaniṣads", *Bulletin of the Second All Orissa Sanskrit Conference*, Bhubaneswar, 1975.

"Smaraṇa : utpatti aur Vikāśa", (Hindi)—*Aligarh Muslim University Journal*, Aligarh, 1975.

"Kośalānanda Mahākāvya", *Prof. Veermani Upādhyāya Felicitation Volume*, Pillani, Rajasthan.

"Orissa", *Sanskrit Studies inside India, 1979-1981*, Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, Delhi, 1981.

"Birth of Agastya and Vaśiṣṭha", *Prof. Baladeva Upādhyāya Felicitation Volume*, Allahabad, 1984.

"Introduction to *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*", (Oriya) *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, edited & Translated by Sri S. Mishra, Cuttack, 1984.

III

REMINISCENCES

डक्टर श्री अनामचरणस्वाइँ महोदयानां साशीर्वादसंवर्धना

कलोत्तरैर्भास्वरकीर्त्तिजालैः प्रपूरिते चोत्कलभूमिभागे ।
चकास्ति सम्यग् भुवनेश्वराख्यं पुरं प्रसिद्धं भुवनेशयुक्तम् ॥ १ ॥

यत्रैव विश्वा विलसन्ति विद्याः स विश्वविद्यालय एव तत्र ।
नित्यं जनानन्दकरः स वाणी-विहारनाम्ना परिकीर्त्तितोऽस्ति ॥ २ ॥

तत्रैव गीर्वाणवचोविभागः परं प्रणीतोऽस्ति धरातलेऽस्मिन् ।
समुन्नतिं गच्छति यः प्रकामं दिनं दिनं प्रोन्नतिमार्गधावी ॥ ३ ॥

तदुन्नतौ मुख्यतमं निदानं, प्राध्यापकानां प्रवरः सुविद्वान् ।
शिष्टैर्विशिष्टैश्चिरमादृतो यो, विराजते सद्विनयोज्ज्वलश्रीः ॥ ४ ॥

छात्रेषु यः स्नेहभरं बिभर्त्ति भद्रेषु भद्रांमतिमातनोति ।
विद्वत्सु बद्धादरबुद्धिरद्धा-पथान्न जातु च्यवते कदाचित् ॥ ५ ॥

सम्भाषतेऽयं स्वगुणैर्महीयान् रम्यां गिरं शुद्धतमामवक्राम् ।
व्यलीकलेशोऽपि न चास्य वाण्या-मालक्षितो दोषविदां वरेण्यैः ॥ ६ ॥

न भेददृष्ट्या स्वजनान्यबुद्ध्या निरीक्ष्यते छात्रजनोऽमुना वै ।
सदानसूयाप्रवणो महात्मा यो डक्टराणामपि डक्टरोऽस्ति ॥ ७ ॥

सोऽनामनामा विदुषां वरेण्यः, सदा सदाशीर्वचसां निवासः ।
तस्याद्य सेवा परिपूर्त्तिमाप्ता, शुद्धा विशुद्धस्य गुणोत्करस्य ॥ ८ ॥

भूयः पदं प्रोन्नतमेतु तूर्णं भूयो विदां प्रीतिकरोऽस्तु सम्यक् ।
शतं समाः सुस्थतया रसायां विराजतां बन्धुजनैः समेतः ॥ ९ ॥

इतीत्थमाशीर्वचनं ममात्र-नद्धस्य सम्यक् सुगुणैस्तदीयैः ।
अग्र्यं सतां तं समवाप्य धन्यं स्वजन्मसाफल्यमुरीकरोतु ॥ १० ॥

पण्डित श्री कुलमणि मिश्र शर्मा
हावेलिगलि, पुरी

गुरूणां गुरवे नमः

वाणीपीठेऽमरा वाणी - साधक-शेखराय च ।
तस्मै परमपूज्याय गुरूणां गुरवे नमः ॥ १ ॥
सौम्याय शान्तरूपाय सर्व-सद्गुण-शालिने ।
तस्मै परमपूज्याय गुरूणां गुरवे नमः ॥ २ ॥
नानाशास्त्र-धुरीणाय साक्षाद् विनय-मूर्त्तये ।
तस्मै परमपूज्याय गुरूणां गुरवे नमः ॥ ३ ॥
सदाचार-स्वरूपाय सुशिष्य-वत्सलाय च ।
तस्मै परमपूज्याय गुरूणां गुरवे नमः ॥ ४ ॥
सदा निरभिमानाय गुणैक-पक्षपातिने ।
तस्मै परमपूज्याय गुरूणां गुरवे नमः ॥ ५ ॥
गवेषणैकशीलाय बहूनां मार्गदर्शिने ।
तस्मै परमपूज्याय गुरूणां गुरवे नमः ॥ ६ ॥
मादृशा यस्य शतशो महाविद्यालयादिषु ।
तस्मै परमपूज्याय गुरूणां गुरवे नमः ॥ ७ ॥
अपरे बहुशः सन्ति नानापद-विभूषिताः ।
तस्मै परम पूज्याय गुरूणां गुरवे नमः ॥ ८ ॥
सोऽयं गुरुवरोऽस्माकं स्वकर्त्तव्य-परायणः ।
कार्य्यक्षेत्राद् विधानेना - वसरं लभतेऽधुना ॥ ९ ॥
लब्धेऽप्यवसरे कार्य्याल् - लप्स्यते समयं वहुम् ।
सेवार्थं सुरभारत्या यथापूर्वमतन्द्रितः ॥ १० ॥
प्रार्थनेयं सदास्माकं स जीव्यात् शरदां शतम् ।
सदा निरामयो भूत्वा परिवार-समन्वितः ॥ ११ ॥
पूर्वस्नेहः सदास्मासु शिष्येषु कृपयास्तु वै ।
स्मरिष्यामो वयं सर्वे मा भवान् विस्मरिष्यति ॥ १२ ॥

श्री सदाशिव प्रहराजः
संस्कृत-प्राध्यापकः

श्रीमद् अनामाष्टकम्

वेदादिशास्त्रेषु विशुद्धबुद्धि-
वेदान्तविद्यागमपारदृश्वा ।
प्रज्ञावतां मौलिकलापभूषो
जयत्यनामः शरदां शतानि ॥ १ ॥

संस्कृतसाहित्यरसानुरक्तः
स मानितोऽप्युत्कलपुत्रवर्गैः ।
संसेविता भारती तेन साक्षाद्
विराजते मूर्त्तिमतीह लोके ॥ २ ॥

पितेव सर्वान् परिपाल्य छात्रान्
ज्ञानप्रदानेन च सौहृदेन ।
प्रेमादरक्षान्तिपरो हि नित्यं
विभ्राजते संस्कृतदेशिकेन्द्रः ॥ ३ ॥

या भारती शिष्यहिताय तेन
प्रचोदिता, याति हि भारतेषु ।
संस्थापिताप्यक्षरमालिनी च
कीर्त्तिःपुनर्भारतसंस्कृतिषु ॥ ४ ॥

भ्रमन् विदेशेषु सुदीर्घकालं
प्राप्यामृतं ज्ञानमयं तु येन ।
दत्तं स्वछात्रेभ्यऽप्रकातरेण
तेनैव सर्वं विदुषां वरेण ॥ ५ ॥

स्वाध्यायवान् धर्मपरायणश्च
स्वशीलवान् संस्कृतकर्मवीरः।
स्वसंस्कृतिप्रेमरसे निमग्नः
स्वधर्मरक्षासु सदा प्रसन्नः ॥ ६ ॥

चित्तं यथा वाक् च तथा हि यस्य
क्रियाः समस्ताः वचनानुरूपाः।
तस्यैव साधोर्विजयाय नित्यं
भद्रं जगन्नाथ करोतु सर्वम् ॥ ७ ॥

शुभास्ते पन्थानः भवतु हि मनः कर्ममुखरं
शरीरं नित्यं प्राकृतिकविकृतिवर्जितमपि।
इषद्धासः सम्यक् प्रसरतु सदा तेऽधरपुटे
मतिस्तु श्रीकृष्णे विलसतु चिदानन्दजगति ॥ ८ ॥

विनीतः
डक्टर भगवान् पण्डाशर्मा
१६-१०-८४

तेभ्यो गुरुभ्यो नमः

मन्त्रमूलं गुरोर्वाक्यं
पूजामूलं गुरोः पदम्।
ध्यानमूलं गुरोर्मूर्त्तिः
मोक्षमूलं गुरोः कृपा ॥ १ ॥

संशोभते भारत भूर्महार्हैः
रत्नैरशेषैः परितः प्रकीर्णैः।
यत्रागमाय स्पृहयन्ति देवाः
स्वर्गीयसौख्यं परिहाय सद्यः ॥ २ ॥

तत्रैकदेशे यशसां निधानम्
संशोभते "उत्कलदेश" एषः।
यत्रास्ति रम्यं प्रथितं च लोके
विष्णोः परं धाम "क्षितिये"त्याहुः ॥ ३ ॥

तस्यां सुधांशुविमले सुकुले बभूव
श्रीमान् सतां गुणधरोऽयमनाम एषः।
यस्यावदातचरितान्यधुनापि लोका
आदर्शवद् व्यवहरन्ति न संशयोऽत्र ॥ ४ ॥

बाल्याद् गुणाः प्रकटिता महनीयकीर्त्तेः
कस्तूरिका निजगुणान् प्रकटीकरोति।
दत्वा मनो गुरुपदे निखिलाश्च विद्याः
काले महानधिजगे स्वगुरुप्रसादात् ॥ ५ ॥

यामाश्रित्य प्रसरति यशो भारतीयां पृथिव्यां
गर्भे यस्या निहितमखिलं राजते तत्त्वजातम्।
आर्यर्षीणां हृदि सुविमले निर्मलं या चकास्ति
सेयं वाणी विहरति सदा तस्य जिह्वाग्रभागे ॥ ६ ॥

प्राप्ते काले समधिकतया श्रद्धया भक्तिसारैः
वाराणस्यां गुरुवरपदे निश्चलं सन्निधाय।
ज्ञानं सर्वं कलितममलं वेदविद्यासु सारं
ख्यातो विद्वन्मणिरिव सतां राजते पण्डितोऽयम् ।७।

ज्ञानानुरागात् स गतो विदेशं
स्निग्धान् समग्रान् प्रविहाय बन्धून्।
तत्रापि वेदान्तसमृद्धचेता
लेभे स्वकीर्त्तिं महनीयकीर्त्तिः ॥ ८ ॥

वेदान्तानपि काव्यशास्त्रनिचयं गीतापुराणान्यपि
मीमांसादिविशेषदर्शनविधिं सूक्तीः सुधास्यन्दिनीः।
सर्वं संस्कृतवाङ्मयं पुनरसौ पाश्चात्यविद्यामपि
श्रीविश्वेशकृपाकटाक्षवशतः क्षिप्रं पठत्यादरात् ।९।

देवीं वाचमुपासते हि बहवः सारं तु सारस्वतं
जानीते नितरामसौ गुरुकुलक्लिष्टप्रधानः सुधीः।
व्युत्पत्तिं परमामवाप्तुमवधिं सम्यक्च यश्चेष्टते
गाहन्तेऽखिलशास्त्रकाननमतिक्षीणा
अपि प्राणिनः ।१० ॥

अज्ञातान् बहुशो विशेषविषयान् स्नेहेन विज्ञापयन्
साश्चर्यं सकुतूहलं सविनयं येनापि संबोध्यते ।
यस्याध्यापनकौशलेन सततं तुष्टाश्च शिष्योत्तमा:
कर्मण्येव बुधार्थिनो विजयते सोऽयं गुणीन्द्रो
महान् ॥ ११ ॥

सौजन्ये विनये नये प्रवचने निर्देशने पाठने
पाण्डित्ये प्रणये समस्तविदुषामाद्ये च संशोभते ।
निष्ठा-सत्य-विवेक-धैर्य-करुणा-मैत्रीगुणालङ्कृतः
दाक्षिण्येऽपि भवादृशो गुणिगुणग्राही न
संदृश्यते ॥ १२ ॥

धन्यौ तौ पितरौ च ते गुरुवरा धन्याश्च यज्जन्मना
धन्या बन्धुजना अपि प्रियगणा धन्या हि
यत्कर्मणा ।
यत्संस्पर्शमवाप्य पावनमिदं धन्याश्च छात्रा वयम्
सोऽयं पण्डितमण्डनो विजयते कीर्त्यातिभास्वत्तनुः ॥ १३ ॥

इच्छा सज्जनसंगमे परगुणे श्रद्धा गुरौ नम्रता
विद्यायां व्यसनं सुमिष्टकथनं भक्तिश्च नारायणे ।
शत्रौ क्षान्तिगुणः परोपकरणं मितस्य सम्भाषणं
येष्वेते निवसन्ति निर्मलगुणास्तेभ्यो गुरुभ्यो
नमः ॥ १४ ॥

श्रीमान् दुःशासन ओझा

श्रद्धाञ्जलिः

शान्ताः प्रज्ञानिहितमतयो सत्यधर्मैकनिष्ठाः
विद्वच्छ्रेष्ठाः प्रकृतिसरलाः सूक्ष्मदृष्ट्या विशिष्टाः ।
विद्वद्वृन्देऽप्यतिशयतया प्रीतिभाजो भवन्ति
आचार्यास्ते विगलितमलां कीर्त्तिमेवाधियन्तु ॥

येषां प्रीतिप्रमुखवचनैः शास्त्रविश्लेषणेन
विद्याप्रीत्या गुणिगणगुणग्राहितासंप्रयोगात् ।
शिष्यप्रीत्या वयमधिगता शुद्धतां सर्वदैव
आचार्यास्ते विगलितमलां कीर्त्तिमेवाधियन्तु ॥

धन्या भाषा गलितकलुषा सम्भृता संस्कृता नो
देवैर्वन्द्या मुदितहृदयैर्देवभाषेति यस्मात् ।
तत्पूजायां निहितहृदया सादरं ये भवन्ति
आचार्यास्ते विगलितमलां कीर्त्तिमेवाधियन्तु ॥

दृश्यं विश्वं कथितमखिलं मायिकं शास्त्रदृष्ट्या
आत्मन्येकां सकलनिगमा सत्यतां संगिरन्ते ।
एतद्दृष्ट्यावसरमपि ये प्रापिता कीर्त्तिभाजः
आचार्यास्ते विगलितमलां कीर्त्तिमेवाधियन्तु ॥

योऽयं नीलाद्रिकन्दे प्रकटितविजयः प्राणिनां दुःखहारी
सर्वात्मा सर्वशक्तिः सकलगुणमयोऽप्यद्वयस्तत्त्वदृष्ट्या ।
तस्य श्रीदारुमूर्त्तेः परमकरुणया धौतसर्वान्तरङ्गाः
आचार्याः सर्वभावैः प्रगुणितविभवाः शान्तिमेवाधियन्तु ॥

मिनति मिश्रः

कुसुमाञ्जलिः

यस्याङ्घ्रिपङ्कजसुधामकरन्दबिन्दु-
निस्यन्दसुन्दरमुपव्रजतां मनःसु ।
शोकं विघाटयति घाटयति प्रवृत्तौ
मान्यो मनस्वितिलको मयि सन्निधत्ताम् ॥ १ ॥

हे जन्मभूमिवरभूषण सिद्धसाधो
साहित्यनन्दनवनोज्ज्वलपारिजात ।
प्राच्यप्रतीच्यमिलने गृहीतैकदीक्ष
हे विश्रुतश्रुतिधर प्रतिभानपूण्य ॥ २ ॥

विद्वत्प्रियाय निखिलागमपारगाय
पात्राय दत्ततनयः स्मयमानचित्त ।
हार्भङ्तः ननु गुरोर्धिगुपाधिकन्या
का नेच्छति प्रियतमे प्रियतां तथायुः ॥ ३ ॥

देदीप्यमानप्रतिभाधर हे वरेण्य
पूषेव राजितबुधः गुरुसङ्गतश्च ।
नानानिबन्धविषपूरितगोष्ठिबन्धे
नैके सुधारसछटाधिगतात्मवृत्तिः ॥ ४ ॥

वाणीविहारसरसीव मरालोऽरालः
सारस्वते लसति भव्यरसानुभूतिः ।
आङ्गलोर्मिषेण सततं बहुलब्धलेखः
पाश्चात्यपौर्वविबुधैरभिनन्द्यमानः ॥ ५ ॥

जात्यादिनामसहितं खलु वेद्यवस्तु
नाकारमुद्वहसि योन प्रतिभासहेतुः ।
क्वानामचित्रचरितं क्व च मन्दबुद्धिः
जाने तथापि रसना चपलायते मे ॥ ६ ॥

जातीयसंस्कृतिविकाशगुणात्यधीर
चित्रं नृसिंहतनुचित्रप्रकाशरम्यम् ।
पौराणमन्थनभवं तवकं विलोक्य
मोमुद्यतेऽपिहृदयं रिपुसुन्दरीणाम् ॥ ७ ॥

तद्दिव्यदर्शनमलौकिकशक्तिमत्ते
राराजतां क्षितितले चिरवन्दनीय ।
वाङ्माधुरी मतिमतां रतिमेतु शुद्धाम्
तद्भव्यभूतिरतुला चिरमेव भातु ॥ ८ ॥

हे सिद्धसाधक सदाशय सुप्रसन्न
नैकार्त्तिभेदनविकाशितविश्वरूप ।
वाचा विचित्रमधुपूरप्रसारदक्ष
वाचालताविचालितान् कृपया नु रक्ष ॥ ९ ॥

नित्यं वसन्ततिलकं सरसीव शान्ते
स्थास्यत्यदः सरसिजाब्जरुचं दधानम् ।
विभ्राजतां मधुभरैः कुसुमाञ्जलिनैः
सर्वान् प्रमोदयतु पर्वशशीव साक्षात् ॥ १० ॥

श्रद्धापञ्चकम्

अनामेभ्यः सद्भ्यः प्रणतिपरिचारैर्धवलिता
वयं शास्त्रस्पृष्टोन्नतसकलशिष्या विकसिता ।
महाकीर्त्तिःप्रीत्या धृतसरलमूर्त्या निगडितो
गुणे दुग्धे लुब्धो भवति मतिमान्सारसगतिः ॥१॥

यदा कश्चिच्छात्रो भवति सुमति र्भीतहृदयः
समेत्यास्यस्थानं प्रणयति भवान्मानस-मलम् ।
पराजित्यानिष्टं मतिरचितशान्तिं गमयति
समुत्साहैर्वाक्यै र्भवतिमहतां स्नेहसमितिः ॥२॥

अबोध्या या विद्या त्वननिसरला धावनपरा
सदा तां सामान्यैर्द्रुतमधुरवाक्यैर्द्रढयति ।
अनित्यं नित्यं वा गणयति भवान्साम्यमनसा
त्वसारे संसारे समविषमभोक्ता स्थिरमतिः ॥३॥

सुविज्ञप्राचार्य ! प्रकृतिसरल ! प्राप्तवयसि
समादिष्टंसम्यग् विविधविषये छात्रसकलान् ।
भवान्हि प्राचुर्याभिनवरुचिरस्निग्धवचनै
र्विवेकाद्रे विज्ञापितपथसमालिङ्गनपरः ॥४॥

शुभाशीर्वादः भो ! नयसरणिसिद्धौ प्रचलतु
समेषां शान्तिः भो ! शुभहृदयवाक्यैर्घटयतु ।
भयं शीघ्रं सांसारिकसकलकार्याद्धरतु नः
त्वपेक्षायां वर्त्ते नवनयमुपेतुं शुभमतेः ॥५॥

श्री क्षीरोद चन्द्र दाशः

At the Lotus-feet of My Guru Prof. Dr. A. C. Swain

[I became immensely pleased when a letter from my friend Prof. R. M. Dash, Deptt. of Sanskrit met me and informed me about the publication of the Felicitation Volume on the completion of the 60th year of my guru Dr. A. C. Swain, the Professor and H. O. D. of Sanskrit, Utkal University, Vanivihar. This effort is highly commendable.

As an alumnus of this department of Sanskrit, on this occasion of the retirement of my Guru Dr. Swain, I implore my desired deity Mother *Śāralā* to make the rest-life of my Guru happy and vivacious. Soliciting the benisions from my Guru, I here send my send-off to him.]

"Au fait in english he is, and being adept in sanskrit,
Nattily he teaches everything, novelty is his quality.
As magicians coax the mind of the spectators,
Markedly he teaches a boy of weak apprehension;
And his literary acumen proves his scholarship.

Cat-guru he is, not a monkey-guru.
He helps his students giving hertative teaching.
Audacious not; but a man who is sedate.
Realises and solves the problems of his students.
Appearance shows his modesty and simplicity.
Non-feasance is a dream for him; he is very active.
Argus-eyed as he is, problems never come upon him.

Scathing not, prolix not, ambrocial is his speech.
Wrath never appears in the welkin of his countenance.
Amicably and amiably he mixes with all.
In his department, he is proved as a man of deportment,
No pain no gain is the motto of his noble life",

Purna Chandra Ojha

BYREE TO BOSTON

From Byree to Boston is a long way !! Or, is it ?

Byree village in Cuttack District, and Boston city in Masachusetts (U. S. A.) are not far off for a scholar of Sanskrit literature like Professor A. C. Swain. He went from Byree to Banaras to study Sanskrit for his Master in Arts (M.A.) Degree at B.H. U. From Banaras to Harvard University, Boston, was the next logical step for research to get another Master Degree (A.M.) and the Ph.D. (Harvard). Then from Boston to Berlin was a quick trip to visit Max Mullar's country, and to acquaint oneself with the intellectual fervor in which Sanskrit studies *should* properly be carried on.

For an Oriya boy of Byree village to get laurels at Banaras Hindu University, and then at Harvard University, U.S.A., to say the least, is a remarkable achievement. To Dr. A.C. Swain belongs the credit of being the first Oriya scholar to have obtained Ph.D. in Sanskrit from the world's most celebrated and prestigious university : Harvard University. His days at Divinity Hall in Harvard campus were days of study, research, and self-realisation. (Harvard Divinity School was established in 1816, so you can imagine what a reputed institution it is).

This gifted son of the Goddess of learning, Sarasvatī, quenched his thirst for knowledge by voracious reading at Harvard's famous library, named Harry Elkins Widner Memorial Library. (Harvard Library, incidentelly, is the largest and oldest university library in the USA, having more than ten million books—one crore books).

I have seen Professor Swain at his home, in his hostel room, and in his office room. He is always in company of books...books which contain the essence of civilisation and culture : *Vedas*, *Purāṇas* and *Śāstras*. His "company" consists of books, students, and research scholars. I have noticed a few scholars from far-off Germany coming to discuss their research projects with him at Vani Vihar. Surely there must be something in the intellectual attainments of Dr. Swain that could draw scholars from other parts of the world.

Dr. Swain is an engaging conversationalist. He quotes from scriptures, refers to anecdotes of hundred years ago as described in the *Śāstras*; and he discusses those so feelingly as if it happened only yesterday. He conducts a class with his heart and soul immersed in teaching. He *does* relish teaching.

Dr. Swain is an extra-ordinarily sincere teacher. He has also great respect for his *own* teachers. He often mentions with much devotion about his teachers at P. M. Academy where he completed his high school education. He never fails to admire Sri Basanta Kumar Das, the-then Head-master of P. M. Academy, and one of his brilliant teachers. Dr. Swain is all praise not only for his teachers from high school days, but also for Professor Ingalls of the Harvard University under whom he did his doctoral research. It is a striking fact about Dr. Swain's personality that he remembers his teachers so fondly, and speaks of them with limitless admiration. That shows how absorbed he is with teaching and how he respects *his* teachers.

Dr. Swain's students in their turn also have genuine regard and affection for their Professor. The students whom he taught at G. M. College, Sambalpur, way back in 1950, still come to pay respect to Dr. Swain. With equal admiration, Dr. Swain's students and research scholars bow down before him.

Prof. Swain has served Utkal University for more than twentyseven years. It was Utkal University's good fortune that a Harvard Ph.D. came to its faculty in the Department of Sanskrit as early as 1957. From the very beginning, Dr. Swain has emphasised study of Sanskrit in its proper perspective, i.e. to merge oneself in the richness of Indian Philosophy, History and Culture. I have seen Dr. Swain engaged in deep discussions with Professor of Philosophy, and Professor of History of Utkal University on scholarly issues. It delighted me that an inter-disciplinary approach to study of Sanskrit has been fostered by Dr. Swain.

My assessment is that, if nothing else, Dr. Swain has inculcated a breadth of vision, and abiding love for Sanskrit among his pupils; and ex-pupils. Those who carried on their doctoral research under the supervision of Professor A.C. Swain know that he is meticulous with regard to facts, and to originality in analysis. That is the Harvard spirit !!

What Dr. Swain symbolises is devotion to duty, search for knowledge, and dedication to scholarship. Byree to Banaras to Boston to Vani Vihar— — — the pursuit of learning is endless.

Dr. Surya Kanta Das

THOU ART NAMELESS

That's how the Alekhites continue to contemplate on the Formless, Unwritten, Supreme Lord of the Universe—one and second to none. He cannot be described. He cannot be expressed in writing. Hence He is *Alekha*. In other words, He is nameless (*Anāma*). Utterance implies *Name* (*Nāma*), and non-utterance the nameless (*Anāma*). He is to be realised by surrendering oneself ever and anon (*Sadā nitya bārambāra*). A Sanyāsin of this unique Alekha cult belonging to the Valkaladhārī Par Saṁgas order Biswanāth *Bābā* by name is said to have christened the young grand-son of Fakir Swain as Anāma. Bābā is alive today. He belongs to the second line in the order. He is the oldest and the wisest. He propounds Viśuddhādvaita Brahmavāda (non-dualism of puritanic *Brahmavāda*) as the Philosophy of Mahimā Dharma.

Why did he visit Fakir Swain's house ? Not that the Byree village was located near the Railway station on the South Eastern Railways which have now divided the village as Upper and Lower Byree. Bābā also does not travel by train. It was not a chance visit either. He was not even drawn to Fakira Swain's house as he was a great agriculturist of name and fame in the area. The point is that Fakir Swain was a great devotee of the cult. Though a lay desciple, Bhakta Fakir lived like a Sannyāsin with complete indifference to the wordly ties. Not only that, Ātma Bhakti Jñāna was at his self, so much so that he placed all his belongings at the service of the Sannyāsins. Since he was absorbed in Anāma Nāma (अनाम हृदेध्यायि), nothing could be more dear to him than the only grandson named as Anāma, child Anāma being second in birth after Umā. Both Umā and Anāma suffered from smallpox at a tender age and Umā passed away. Anāma survived. That it is why elder people in and around Byree are still prone to say that Professor Swain is what today due to the blessings and good deeds of his grandfather Fakira Swain.

Perhaps this example of munificence, indifference and austerity was not considered healthy to the promotion of the family prosperity and so Ganeswar Swin did not go the way of his father in religious practice. The Tungi conducted by Fakir Swain in Lower Byree on a plot of land donated by a co-villager at the request of the former, stands demolised today due to want of timely repairs etc. and another has come up in Upper Byree. I understand that Dr. Swain stands committed to bear the cost of construction if it is revived in Lower Byree. The mahimā sannyāsins still pay occasional visits to his family. Dr. Swain remembers the names of Lachman Das Bābā and Paban Das Bābā of whom the latter breathed his last only two years ago. Biswanāth Bābā is no exception. He used to take his alms while Dr. Swain was working in the Ravenshaw College as Reader in the Department of Sanskrit and Oriya. At that time, he was associated with the publication of Bābā's monumental treatise सर्व वेद वेदान्त सारतत्त्व शिरोमणि अलेख परंब्रह्म दर्शनम् Vol. I published by the Utkal University. This is acknowledged by the author in his introduction to the Volume. When occasions arise I have seen Bābā referring to Professor Anam with fondness and favour as one who can be relied on for support to the mahimā monument.

A volley of questions arise in my mind. Two such questions are uppermost in me. They are (i) What led him to choose Harvard for his Ph.D.? and (ii) How could he specialise in Sanskrit from the School stage ? To these questions, Professor Swain pours out his experiences with utmost joy. Sometimes he departs from his usual conversational styles and makes hurried references to men and materials now, then mixed in the emotions. He had his P.G. education at Benares during 1946-48. *Karpūra Mañjari*, a *Prakrit* drama of Rajasekhara was one of his texts and it was taught to him by Pandit Baladeva Upadhyaya. The text was edited by Professor Sten Konow of Norway. Panditji's scholarly interpretation of the text was made impressive as he referred now and then to English translation by Professor Charles Rockwell Lanman under the Harvard Oriental Series. The young scholar was greatly enthused in the study. At the same time, the print, get-up and the format of the English translation made a mark on him and a dream to pursue his studies at Harvard came winking in his mind. Dreams are after all dreams. Do they ever come true ? That is how young Swain might have disposed of his exciting dream, apparently as baseless.

Time rolled on and after successful completion of his P. G. education, Mr. Swain was appointed as a lecturer in Sanskrit in the Gangadhara Meher College at Sambalpur during 1949. As is natural to the age and stage in life and the hazards of the teaching profession to which he was a fresher. there came a period when indecision, uncertainty scepticism and may be defeatism came clouding over his mind. Fortunately for him he found in Mr. Surya Kanta Das who happend to be his colleague in the G.M. College and left for the Harvard for Ph.D. degree in his subject, a friend who gave a new turn to his life. A man of conviction and a tower of strength, he was by nature and to Mr Swain, he gave hopes of future specialisation in his subject and put Mr. Swain in touch with Professor Daniel H.H. Ingall of Harvard. Optimism dawned on his mind as he saw hopes of his dream once dreamt of study at Harvard coming true. That's a friend indeed and Professor Swain never fails to make repeated mention in the course of his conversation with me. Like misfortune never coming alone, fortune peculiarly for Mr. Swain never came alone. A seat in Harvard University, the prestigious one in the world was arranged. Full Bright Travel grant was fixed up. Mr. Rangalal Modi, a businessman of Cuttack city who had his rice-mill at Byree advanced a loan of Rs. 8000/- adjustable on supply of paddy by Shri Ganeswar Swain. I can see a link hue as the family of Mr.Modi was associated with Biswanāth Bābāi.

Professor Swain admits that he owes his research bent of mind to his training at Harvard and his study of the German texts in Sanskrit. This has been reflected in his critical analyses on *Śiva, Sarasvatī, Gaṇeśa* and *Sarpa* which appeared in the form of essay in Oriya monthly *Jhaṁkāra*. His originality lies in his critical probe in to the existence of such god and goddesses. He asserts that they exist in imagination in refutation of the Vedāntik mahāvākya *Tat Tvam Asi*. This is traceable to the study of Śaṁkara and ultimately his upbringings in Mahimā way of living.

Professor Swain justifies his name Anāma.

Dr. Satrughna Nath

Prof. Dr Anam Charan Swain : An Appreciation

अभिवादनशीलस्य नित्यं वृद्धोपसेविनः ।
चत्वारि तस्य वर्द्धन्ते आयुर्विद्यायशोबलम् ॥

Manu Saṁhitā : 2. 121

गुणानां च विशालानां सत्काराणां च नित्यशः ।
कर्तारः सुलभा लोके विज्ञातारस्तु दुर्लभाः ॥

Svapnavāsavadattam : 4.9

To be respectful to one's teachers and wise men, to remember little acts of benefits previously rendered, to follow the path of justice, free from undue influence, are some of the remarkable qualities which characterise 'Dr. Anama Charana Svāmī' (Svāmī corrupted into Oriya as Svāin) who is to retire shortly as Professor and Head of the Post-Graduate Department of Sanskrit, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar.

Anam Charan was born in the village Bairi in the district of Cuttack on 3-1-1925 in the family of a well-to-do land owner. His father Ganeswara Swain by his industry had become the chief agriculturist and prominent man of the village, helping the needy and distressed in difficult times. Healthy and well fed cattle are the main stay of agriculture and Anam Charan, on occasions, took pleasure in feeding the domestic cattle personally. His '*Pitṛ-sevā*' and '*go-sevā*' as the eldest son of the family made up the foundation of his later life.

He matriculated from P. M. Academy school in the year 1942 and studied in Ravenshaw College, Cuttack for four years and graduated from the same, securing first class Hons. in Sanskrit.

He then joined as a student the P. G. Sanskrit Department of Benares Hindu University and passed the M.A. examination in Sanskrit in the first class in the year 1948. He, respectfully recollects the erudition of his Professor of the Benares Hindu University.

He joined the Orissa Education Service on 18-10-1949 as a lecturer in Sanskrit, and after serving for about 4 years in Government College/Colleges in Orissa was relieved from 7-8-1952 for study abroad.

He studied in the Harvard University of America under Prof. Ingalls and got his Ph.D. degree on Śaṁkara's Commentary on *Brahmasūtra.*

• Soon after returning to India through London, he joined the P. G. Department of Sanskrit, Utkal University as Reader and after working as such for a few years was promoted as Professor of Sanskrit and Head of the Department in the year 1973.

Once lying at the Death's door due to an accident, he revived chiefly due to the devotion of Mrs. Swain.

During his tenure of Professorship, several lecturers and research students have got Ph.D. Degrees under his supervision. He has shed new light on Śaṁkara's Bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra*, on the intricate Krishna problem, on the evolution of several Paurāṇic deities from the Vedic period onwards. While guiding research, he is scientific and insatiable in his approach.

I have watched him as a pupil, have worked with him as a colleague and a co-examiner on many occasions. We have been so intimate. My relation with him recalls to my mind the noble relation of preceptor and pupil of Ancient India.

I wish him and his family a happy, healthy and fruitful future.

Dr. K. B. Tripathi

Dr A. C. Swain as I Know Him

I had my first acquaintance with Dr. Anam Charan Swain in the Ravenshaw College, Cuttack, where he was my senior by one year. After his graduation with first class honours in Sanskrit he went to Benares Hindu University for his higher studies and the next year I went to Allahabad University for my post-graduate degree in English. Then for some years we had no contact with each other. Then for a short time we were colleagues in the Samanta Chandra Sekhar College, Puri, in the year 1957-58. Dr. Swain joined the Utkal University in 1958 as Reader in Sanskrit and has adorned the department as Professor since 1973.

Dr. Swain has earned a reputation in the country as a distinguished scholar in oriental learning and has many learned publications to his credit. He spent fur fruitful years at the celebrated Harvard University as a research scholar and obtained his Ph.D. degree writing a thesis on the "Concept of Creation in the Philosophy of Śaṁkara". Some of his valuable works like the critical edition of '*Kośalānanda Mahākāvya*', '*Śaṁskṛta Sāhityara Itihāsa*', and the Oriya translation of Ṛgveda are yet to be published.

I am no competant judge of Dr. Swain's soaring scholastic heights. By his own merit, erudition and diligence he has earned the reputation as a distinguished Indologist in the country. I have always admired him as a man gifted with rare qualities of head and heart. His disarming simplicity and unassuming nature has endeared him to one and all. His deep sense of duty, warm cordiality and high integrities are rare qualities now a days. He takes a special pleasure in feeding others. He gives no airs, has no pretensions. In his scholarly humility and unassuming nature he can be compared with his predecessor in department late Professor Prahllad Pradhan, the eminent Indologist and Sanskrit scholar.

In country, the State of Orissa in particular, expects much more from the scholarly pen of Dr. Swain.

D. C. Kuanr,
State Editor, Gazeteers,
Orissa, Bhubaneswar.

Life a Message

The greatness of a man can be measured not only by his qualities but by the impact of his life on others. This is true to my preceptor Prof. A. C. Swain, who has dedicated his life in teaching in the P. G. Deptt. of Sanskrit, Utkal University since nearly three decades. A simple man in habits, he had attraction towards Oriental studies since his childhood. His study culminated at Harvard, the most renowned university in the U.S.A.

I came in contact with him during my Post-graduate studies in the year 1961, when he was teaching Sanskrit in the P. G. Deptt. of Utkal University. His eloquent teaching gave a sound footing towards our knowledge in Oriental studies. Since then I was thinking to continue my research work under him.

My research for Ph.D. under his able guidance began from 1972. He had a long cherished wish to work on *Kṛṣṇa*. Without hesitation and reservation he agreed to guide me. Sooner or later I completed the work. Busy as he was, he could find out time for me. It was his constant effort and guidance that the work was a success. This long period of work was intervened by the fateful days of his serious illness due to an accident. When most of the victims succumb to such injuries, Prof. Swain recovered. This indicates his strong will power for a long life and he is still active in teaching and guiding many students.

His field of research is on Indian Mythology covering the Vedic literature, the epics and the *Purāṇas*. The main factor of his guidance relates to mythological subjects with an emphasis on historical, sociological and scientific back-ground. He selected the subject for me on the study of the life of *Kṛṣṇa*, the prominent hero of Indian mythology. He is very critical while guiding a research work. His deep insight and approach for a comparative study of Eastern and Western philosophy and religion and knowledge in German language brought success to my work.

The most important part of his life that impressed and influenced me is his regular study. He reads at least about forty pages on his subject every day. Even though quite learned and experienced, he never takes a class unprepared. This is an important aspect which every teacher should put into practice. I seek his advice and guidance freely. He helpes me without hesitation. His life is highly disciplined and systematic. He is regular and a hard worker. His consciousness towards morality, ideals and slmpleness in habits are examplary. His contact with great Oriental Scholars at different Universities of India and abroad shows his popularity.

A great teacher like him, better known as a preceptor, is hardly seen these days. The world is happier amidst such great teachers.

Dr. Shantilata Tripathy

PART-II

सदाशिवः प्रहराजः, पुरी

"अमावास्या गुरुं हन्ति, शिष्यं हन्ति चतुर्दशी"

जगद्गुरुणा भगवता श्रीकृष्णेन गीतायां शास्त्राणां महत्वमधिकृत्य अर्जुनं प्रति स्पष्टं समुद्घोषितं [1] यत् यः शास्त्रस्य विधिमुल्लंघ्य स्वेच्छया प्रवर्त्तते, सः स्वजीवने सुखं सिद्धिं परमां गतिं च नैव लभते। तस्मात् कार्य्याकार्य्य निर्णये शास्त्रमेव परमं प्रमाणम्। तस्य शास्त्रस्य निर्द्देशं ज्ञात्वा तदनुसारं कार्य्यं सदा करणीयम्।

एतादृशि भगवतः सुस्पष्टे निर्द्देशे विद्यमानेऽपि वैदेशिकानां कुप्रभावैः प्रभाविता वयं स्वधर्मशास्त्रस्य विधिं समुल्लंघ्य स्वेच्छया प्रवर्त्तमाना नानाविधानि कुफलानि प्राप्नुमः।

प्रबन्धस्य शीर्षकरूपेण विद्यमानः श्लोकार्द्धः परमप्रसिद्धस्य स्मृतिकारस्य महर्षेः मनोः स्मृतेः चतुर्थाध्यायेऽनध्याय प्रकरणे [2] वर्त्तते। नीहारे=धूमाच्छादितासु दिक्षु, शरध्वनौ वीणाध्वनौ वा, उभयोः प्रातः सायंसन्ध्ययोः अमावास्यायां, चतुर्दश्यां पूर्णिमायाम् अष्टम्यां च अध्ययनमध्यापनं वा न कुर्य्यात्। एवं विधिमुल्लंघ्य अमावास्यादिषु अध्ययने वाध्यापने क्रियमाणे विशेषं दोषं प्रदर्शयति यत्-अमावास्या गुरुं हन्ति, शिष्यं चतुर्दशी हन्ति, अष्टमी पूर्णिमा वा ब्रह्म (वेदं ज्ञानं वा) हन्ति, तस्मात् कारणात् तासु सर्वासु

---

1. यः शास्त्रविधिमुत्सृज्य वर्त्तते कामकारतः।
   न स सिद्धिमवाप्नोति न सुखं न परां गतिम्॥ गीता १६/२३॥

   तस्माच्छास्त्र प्रमाणं ते कार्य्याकार्य्यव्यवस्थितौ।
   ज्ञात्वा शास्त्रविधानोक्तं कर्म कर्त्तुमिहार्हसि॥ १६/२४॥

2. नीहारे वाणशब्दे च सन्ध्ययोरेव चोभयोः।
   अमावास्या-चतुर्दश्योः पौर्णमास्यष्टकासु च॥ ४/११३

   अमावास्या गुरुं हन्ति शिष्यं हन्ति चतुर्दशी।
   ब्रह्माष्टका-पौर्णमास्यौ तस्मात्ताः परिवर्जयेत्॥

   मनुस्मृतिः ४/११४

तिथिषु अध्ययनम् अध्यापनं वा सर्वथा न विधेयम् । मनुस्मृतेः प्रसिद्धटीकाकारः कुल्लूकोऽस्य श्लोकस्य इत्थं टीकां[1] करोति । कुल्लूको यथा अमावास्यादितिथीनां गुर्वादिहनने शक्तिं स्वीकरोति तथैव अपरे मेधातिथि-सर्वज्ञनारायणगोविन्दराज प्रभृतयः टीकाकारा अपि स्वीकुर्वन्ति ।

तस्मादस्य श्लोकस्य भावः सहृदयैः सुधीभिः सविशेषं चिन्तनीयः । घातको यथा पशून् हन्ति, यथा वा महारथी युद्धक्षेत्रे शत्रून् हन्ति, तथैव अमावास्यादिषु तिथिषु अध्यापनादिकं कुर्वतो गुर्वादीन् यद्यपि तास्तिथयो नैव घ्नन्ति, तथापि तथैव हननसदृशीं तेषां महतीम् आयुःक्षयरूपां स्मृतिभ्रंशरूपां विद्या-बुद्धिक्षयसमां हानिं कुर्वन्तीति महर्षिणा हन्तिपद लक्षणया आयुःक्षयादिरूपार्थे प्रयुक्तमितिबोध्यम् ।

अस्माकमायुषः एकोऽपि क्षणः नैव स्वर्णमुद्राकोटिभिरपि लभ्यते[2] । स्मृतिभ्रंश तु मृत्युसम एवेति भगवता श्रीकृष्णेन गीतायां प्रोक्तम्[3] ।

प्रोक्ते श्लोके गुर्वादीनां हनने अमावास्यादि तिथयो महर्षिणा कर्त्तृरूपेण व्यवहृताः । हन्तिपदे गुरुत्वमारोपयितुं तद् द्विवारं प्रयुक्तम् । परिशेषे चतुर्थपादे 'तस्मात्ताः परिवर्जयेत्' इत्यत्र स्वकीयं सिद्धान्तं दृढकण्ठम् उद्घोषयति यत् ताः तिथयः अध्ययनाध्यापनयोः न तु केवलं वर्जयेत् अपितु परिवर्जयेत् = सर्वतोभावेन त्यजेदित्यर्थः ।

तत्रैव श्लोके अमावास्यादितिथीनां निर्दिष्ट-प्रकारेण हानिकरणादेते प्रश्नाः पाठकस्य मनसि स्वतः प्रादुर्भवन्ति । ते प्रश्ना यथा—यतोऽमावास्या अध्यापयन्तं गुरुं हन्ति, तस्मात्,

१. गुरुः अमावास्यायां स्वयमधीयीत न वा ?

२. गुरुः चतुर्दश्यां छात्रान् अध्यापयेत् न वा ? यतश्चतुर्दशी पठन्तं शिष्यं हन्ति, तस्मात्,

---

1. विशेषदोषमाह अमावास्येति । यस्मादमावास्या गुरुं हन्ति,
शिष्यं हन्ति चतुर्दशी, वेद चाष्टमी-पौर्णमास्यौ
विस्मारयतः, तस्मात्ताः अध्ययनाध्यापनयोः परित्यजेत् । इति ।
मनुस्मृतिः, २/११४ श्लोके टीकाकारः कुल्लूकः, पृ-३८३

2. आयुषः क्षण एकोऽपि न लभ्यः स्वर्णकोटिभिः ।
चाणक्यः
सूक्ति सुधाकर, नीति सूक्तिः, श्लोक ६२, पृ-१५०

3. स्मृतिभ्रंशाद् बुद्धिनाशो, बुद्धिनाशात् प्रणश्यति ॥
गीता २/६३ ।

३. शिष्यः अमावास्यायां पठेत् न वा ?

४. गुरुः चतुर्दश्यां पठेत् न वा ?

एतेषां सर्वेषां प्रश्नानामेकमेव अतीवसंक्षिप्तमुत्तरं महर्षिणा चतुर्थपादे "तस्मात्ताः परिवर्जयेत्" इत्यत्र प्रदत्तम् । गुरुः शिष्यो वा ताः सर्वाः तिथीः परिवर्जयेत् । एतासां सर्वासां तिथीनां परिवर्जने कारणमपि स्वल्पालोचनेन स्पष्टीभवति ।

सूत्रकारो बौधायनः स्वसमये सुधीभिः समुदाहृतं श्लोकं समुद्धृत्य कथयति[1] यत् पञ्चदशी (पूर्णिमा अमावास्या वा) विद्यां हन्ति । स्मृतिकारः यमः[2] शङ्खोऽपि[3] पञ्चदशी बुद्धिं नाशयतीति समुद्घोषयतः । तेनामावास्यायां गुरुः शिष्यो वा न पठेत् । गुरुः चतुर्दश्यामपि छात्रान् न पाठयेत् यतः पाठन समये छात्राणां बोधो भवति । बोधः पठनस्य मुख्यमङ्गम् । तेन छात्राः पठन्तीति वक्तुं शक्यते । चतुर्दश्यां छात्राणां यदा बोधः पठनं वा भवति, तर्हि श्लोकानुसारं "शिष्यं हन्ति चतुर्दशी" । तस्माद् गुरुश्चतुर्दश्यामपि छात्रान् न पाठयेत् । न वासौ गुरुश्चतुर्दश्यां पठेत् । पठनावसरे ऽसौ शिष्यो भवति शिष्यं चतुर्दशी हन्ति । तस्मात् गुरुः शिष्यो वा अमावास्यादिषु सर्वासु तिथिषु न पाठयेत् न वा पठेदिति ।

"अमावास्या गुरुं हन्तीति श्लोकेऽपि अमावास्यादयः सर्वास्तिथयो वर्जनीया इति महर्षेराशयो गूढोऽस्तीति विज्ञेयम् । अमावास्या यदा गुरुं हन्ति, तदा शिष्यमपि हन्तीति स्वतो बोध्यम् । तथैव चतुर्दशी यथा शिष्यं हन्ति, तथा गुरुमपि हन्तीति ज्ञेयम् । अष्टमी-पौर्णमास्यौ न केवलं ज्ञानं नाशयतोऽपितु ज्ञाननाशनेन गुरुं शिष्यमपि नाशयत इति महर्षे गूढ आशयो बोध्यः । एतस्मादेव कारणात् महर्षिरन्तिमे पादे "तस्मात्ताः परिवर्जयेत्" इत्यत्र अमावास्यादीनां सर्वासां तिथीनां परिवर्जनमुद्घोषितवान् ।

महर्षिमनुरेव केवलमित्थममावास्यादितिथीनां परिवर्जनमुपदिशति, अपरे धर्मसूत्रकाराः स्मृतिकाराश्च सर्वे समस्वरं तासामेवतिथीनां परिवर्जन प्रायशोऽनुरूपैरेव स्वस्ववचनैः सामान्यभिन्नभावेन सकारणं वा समुद्घोष्य महर्षेर्मतं समर्थयान्ति । तेषां मतान्यधस्ताद् विदुषां विलोकनाय समुपन्यस्तानि ।

---

1. हन्ति पञ्चदशी विद्याम् - बौधायनः १.११.२१.२४

2. हन्ति पञ्चदशी मेधाम्—यमः, धर्मसिन्धौ उद्धृतः, पृ-४२४

3. हन्ति पञ्चदशी मेधाम्—शङ्खः, कृत्यकल्पतरौ उद्धृतः, पृ-२६०

सुप्रसिद्धो धर्मसूत्रकारो बौधायनः[1] अमावास्यादिषु अध्ययनमध्यापनञ्च निषेधयति । पर्वशब्देन विष्णुपुराणानुसारम् अष्टमीद्वयं, चतुर्दशीद्वयं, पूर्णिमा, अमावास्या, रविसंक्रान्तिश्च बुध्यन्ते । सः स्वसमयेऽनध्यायमधिकृत्य विद्वद्भिः समुदाहृतं श्लोकं[2] स्वधर्मशास्त्रे समुद्धृत्य अमावास्यादितिथिषु अनध्यायपालनं सर्वथा करणीयमिति प्रतिपादयति । सूत्रकारः शाङ्खायनो[3]ऽपि सामान्यभावेन निषेधयति । कारणप्रदर्शनं सोऽपरे च अनावश्यकमिति मत्वा न प्रदर्शितवन्तः ।

महर्षिः वशिष्ठो[4]ऽपि तास्वेव तिथिषु अनध्यायं पालयितुं निषेधयति । महर्षिः याज्ञवल्क्यो[5]ऽपि तथैव निवारयति । उशनसं[6] (शुक्राचार्यः) अपि तास्वेव तिथिषु निवारयति । महर्षिः शातातपो[7]ऽपि उपर्युक्तासु तिथिषु निवार्य महोत्सवे, प्रतिपदि, त्रयोदश्याः प्रदोषे अध्ययनाधिकमधिकभावेन निवारयति ।

---

1. पौर्णमास्यष्टकामावास्या........प्रायणेष्वहोरात्रमनध्यायः ।
बौ.ध सू. १.११.२१.६
अहोरात्रयोः सन्ध्ययोः पर्वसु च नाधीयीत ।
बौ.ध सू. १ ११.२१.१६.

2. अथाप्युदाहरन्ति—
हन्त्यष्टमी ह्युपाध्यायं हन्ति शिष्यं चतुर्दशी ।
हन्ति पञ्चदशी मेधां तस्माद् पर्वाणि वर्जयेत् ॥
बौ.ध.सू. १.११.२१.२४

3. "चतुर्दश्योरमावास्यायामष्टकासु पर्वसु च नाधीयीत" ।
शा. गृ. सू. ४.७ ७. १८

4. "चतुर्दश्याममावास्यायामष्टम्यामष्टकासु" (नाधीयीत), वशिष्ठः, १३.८
स्मृतीनां समुच्चये उद्धृतः

5 पञ्चदश्यां चतुर्दश्यामष्टम्यां राहुसूतके (नाधीयीत) , याज्ञवल्क्य स्मृतिः, १.१४६

6. अमावास्यां चतुर्दश्यां पौर्णमास्यष्टमीषु च (नाधीयीत), उशनाः,
धर्मशास्त्रसंग्रहातगतः, पृ-३३५

7. पञ्चदश्यां चतुर्दश्यामष्टकासु महोत्सवे ।
प्रदोषे च त्रयोदश्यामष्टम्यां प्रतिपद्यपि ॥ शातातपः,
स्मृतिचन्द्रिकायामुद्धृतः, पृ-१५५

महर्षिः हारीतो[1]ऽपि शातातप इव अध्ययनादिकं निवारयति। अनध्यायदिवसस्य पूर्वस्यां रात्रावपि कदाचित् नाध्येतव्यमिति स उपदिशति।

इत्थमेते स्मृतिकारा महर्षयोऽनध्याय दिवसादिषु अध्ययनादिकं सामान्यभावेन निवारितवन्तः। अनध्यायदिवसादिषु अनध्ययनमित्थं स्वतःसिद्धं प्रसिद्धं वा येन ते तदर्थं कारणप्रदर्शनमावश्यकमिति नामन्यन्त।

विष्णुस्मृतौ[2] निवारणं सूत्रमाध्यमेन सकारणमतीवशोभनरूपेण प्रतिपादितम्। तदनुसारम् अनध्यायदिवसादिषु अध्ययनादिना इह परलोके वा न किमपि फलं लभ्यते, तेन वरं गुरुशिष्ययोरायुः क्षयो भवतीति। विष्णुस्मृतेः पूर्वोक्ते चतुर्थे सूत्रे अष्टमीषु इति बहुवचनात् पञ्चदश्यां चकारात् प्रतिपदि चाहोरात्रं नाधीयीतेति बोध्यम्।

बृहन्मनु[3]रपि अनध्यायतिथिषु अध्ययनं चाध्यापनं सकारणं दृढं निवारयति। तन्मतेन न तु सर्वासु परं कासुचित् द्वितीयासु[4] अध्यापनादिकं निवारितम्। तदनुसारं फाल्गुन-शुक्लद्वितीयायां,

---

1. प्रतिपत्सु चतुर्दश्यामष्टम्यां पर्वणोर्द्वयोः।
श्वोऽनध्यायेऽद्य शर्वर्यां नाधीयीत कदाचन॥ स्मृतिचन्द्रिकायां, हारीतः, पृ. १५२
2. नाधीयीताहोरात्र चतुर्दश्यष्टमीषु च। विष्णुस्मृतिः, ३०.४
अभियुक्तोऽप्यनध्यायेष्वध्ययनं परिहरेत्। ३०.२८
यस्मादनध्यायाधीतं नेहामुत्र फलप्रदम्। ३०.२९
तदध्ययनेनायुषः क्षयो गुरुशिष्ययोश्चः। ३०.३० श्री विष्णुस्मृतिः
तस्मादनध्यायवर्जं गुरुणा ब्रह्मलोककामेन विद्या सच्छिद्रध्यक्षेत्रेषु वप्तव्या॥ ३०.३१
3. पक्षद्वये चतुर्दश्योरष्टमी द्वितीये तथा।
पक्षादावपि पक्षान्ते ब्रह्म नाधीयते नरैः॥
अष्टमी हन्त्युपाध्यायं शिष्यं हन्ति चतुर्दशी।
अमावास्योभयं हन्ति प्रतिपत् पाठमात्रतः॥ बृहन्मनुः, वाचस्पत्ये उद्धृतः, पृ. १४५
4. को प्रे चै चा द्वितीयास्ताः प्रेतपक्षे गते तु या।
या तु कोजागरे जाते चैत्रावल्यपरेऽहनि॥
चातुर्मास्यसमाप्तौ च द्वितीयायां भवेत्तथा। इति राजमार्त्तण्डः, पृ. २६७
सर्वास्वेतास्वनध्यायः पुराणैः परिकीर्त्तितः॥ पण्डितसर्वस्वे, वाचस्पत्ये पृ. १४५. उद्धृतः।
कृष्णपक्षे द्वितीयायां फाल्गुनाषाढ-कार्त्तिके।
शुक्लाश्वयुग् द्वितीयायां नैवाध्ययनमाचरेत्॥ वाचस्पत्ये गर्गः

आश्विनशुक्लद्वितीयायां, चैत्रकृष्णद्वितीयायां, मार्गशीर्षाषाढ-कार्त्तिक-माघमासानां कृष्णद्वितीयासु च अध्ययनादिकं वर्जयेत् ।

पुनस्तन्मतेन पश्चादौ=प्रतिपदि अनध्ययनं करणीयम् । प्रतिपद्यध्ययने पाठनाशो विद्यानाशो वा भवति । हेमाद्रि[1]रपि बृहन्मनोर्मतं सर्वथा समर्थयति । प्रतिपदि अध्ययनादिनिवारणे कारणं स्पष्टं प्रतिभाति । अमावास्यायाः पूर्णिमाया वा यादृशः प्रभावस्तादृशः प्रायः प्रभावः प्रतिपदि अनुभूयेत यतः पञ्चदशो मेधां विद्यां वा हन्ति, तस्मात् तत्परवर्त्तितिथित्वात् प्रतिपदापि मेधाया विद्याया वा हानिः स्वाभाविकीति तत्तिथौ अध्ययनादिकं निवारितम् ।

प्रतिपदि विद्याध्ययने क्रियमाणे विद्या कीदृशीं क्षीणतमतामुपेता, तत् आदिकवेर्महर्षेर्वाल्मीके-रुपमया स्पष्टीभवति । आदिकविःस्वरामायणस्य सुन्दरकाण्डे श्रीरामं प्रति हनुमतो मुखेन सीताया वर्णनं[2] करोति । प्रतिपदश्चन्द्रकला एतादृशी क्षीणा निष्प्रभा च, सा प्रायशो जनैर्न दृश्यते । हिमर्त्तौ पद्मिनी अतीव क्षीणा सती नश्यति । स्वभावादेव क्षीणाङ्गी सीता श्रीरामचन्द्रस्य विरहेण शोकसन्तापकर्शिता सती प्रतिपदो निष्प्रभा चन्द्रकलेव, हेमन्ते म्लाना शीर्णा पद्मिनीव अतीव क्षीणा जाता ।

आदिकविः महर्षिर्वाल्मीकिः एतादृशीमतीव क्षीणां सीतां प्रतिपत्पाठशीलस्य शिष्यस्य अतीवक्षीणया विद्यया सार्द्धं तुलयति । एतेन स्पष्टं प्रतीयते यत् प्रतिपदि पाठेन विद्या अतीवक्षीणा भवतीति ।

---

1. अष्टमी हन्त्युपाध्यायं शिष्यं हन्ति चतुर्दशी ।
   अमावास्योभयं हन्ति प्रतिपत् पाठनाशिनी ।

   धर्मसिन्धौ हेमाद्रिः, पृ. ४२४

2. राक्षसीभिः परिवृता शोकसन्ताप-कर्शिता ।
   मेघरेखा-परिवृता चन्द्ररेखेव निष्प्रभा ॥ ५. ६. २२
   एकवेणीधरा दीना भर्त्तृचिन्ता-परायणा ।
   अधःशय्या विवर्णाङ्गी पद्मिनीव हिमोदये ॥ ५. ६.२७
   सा प्रकृत्यैव तन्वङ्गी त्वद्वियोगाच्च कर्शिता ।
   प्रतिपत्-पाठशीलस्य विद्येव तनुतां गता ॥ ५. ६.३२

   रामायणे सुन्दरकाण्डे

सुप्रसिद्धः स्मृतिकारः शङ्खोऽपि सकारणमुल्लिखितासु तिथिषु अध्ययनादिकं निषेधयति[1]। तस्य मतानुसारम् अनध्याये क्रियमाणे अध्ययने चाध्यापने शिष्टस्य गुरोश्च आयुः प्रज्ञा, पशुः सुकृतं च सर्वं नश्यति । अष्टमी गुरुं, चतुर्दशी शिष्यं, पूर्णिमा अमावास्या वा मेधां शिष्यस्य गुरोश्च हन्ति। तस्मादनध्यायतिथिषु प्रयत्नपूर्वकम् अध्ययने चाध्यापने निषेधः पालनीयः। पुनस्तन्मतानुसारं पर्वसु (अष्टमी, चतुर्दशी, पूर्णिमा, अमावास्या, संक्रान्तिश्च) प्रजापतिः सर्वविद्यासु निवसति। तासु तिथिषु अध्ययनादौ क्रियमाणे तस्य निवासे बाधा भविष्यतीति धर्मार्थकामः शिष्यः विद्यां परिहरेत्।

स्मृतिकारो लिखितो[2]ऽपि अनध्यायदिवसादिषु अध्ययनादिकं परिहर्त्तुं सकारणमुपदिशति। तस्य मतेन अनध्यायाः छिद्राणि भवन्ति। अनध्यायदिवसेषु ये पठनं पाठनं वा कुर्वन्ति, तेषां ज्ञानामृत-मनध्यायच्छिद्रेण निःसरति। तदा तस्य श्रियं, ब्रह्म, यशो बलं—सर्वम् आदाय राक्षसा गच्छन्ति। तस्मादनध्यायदिवसादिषु विद्या सर्वथा वर्जनीया।

---

1. आयुः प्रज्ञां पशून् मेधां कृन्तामि सुकृतं च यत्।
अनध्यायेष्वभ्यस्यतो ब्रह्म व्याहरतस्तथा॥ कृत्यकल्पतरौ उद्धृतः शङ्खः, पृ. २६०

अनध्यायेष्वध्ययनं वर्जयेच्च प्रयत्नतः।
चतुर्दशीं पञ्चदशीमष्टमीं राहुसूतकम्॥ वाचस्पत्ये
अनध्यायशब्दार्थे उद्धृतः, शङ्खः

अष्टमी हन्त्युपाध्यायं शिष्यं हन्ति चतुर्दशी।
हन्ति पञ्चदशी मेधां तस्मात् पर्वाणि वर्जयेत्॥

प्रजापतिर्हि तिष्ठति सर्वविद्यासु पर्वसु।
तस्माद् धर्मार्थकामो वै नैताः पर्वसु कीर्त्तयेत्॥
कृत्यकल्पतरौ उद्धृतः शङ्खः, पृ. २६०

2. छिद्राण्येतानि राजेन्द्र! येऽनध्यायाः प्रकीर्त्तिताः।
छिद्रेभ्यः स्रवति ब्रह्म ब्राह्मणेन यदर्जितम्॥

तत्काले तस्य रक्षांसि श्रियं ब्रह्म यशो बलम्।
सर्वमादाय गच्छन्ति वर्जयन्तीप्सितं फलम्॥
स्मृतिचन्द्रिकायामुद्धृतो लिखितः पृ. १६५

स्मृतिकारो यमो[1]ऽपि अनध्यायदिवसादिषु अध्ययनं चाध्यापनं सर्वथा परिहर्तुं सकारणमुपदिशति । अनध्यायदिवसादिषु क्रियमाणे पठने वा, यमराजः स्वयं तस्य प्रज्ञां पशून् मेधां नाशयतीति कथयति । तन्मतेन शङ्खमतानुसारमिव अष्टम्यादितिथयः गुरुं शिष्यं मेधां च क्रमेण घ्नन्ति, तस्मात् तासु तिथिषु अध्ययनादिकं सर्वथा न करणीयम् ।

नियममिमं समुल्लंघ्य ये अनध्यायदिवसादिषु वेदादिकं पठन्ति, पाठयन्ति वा, ते वेदविप्लावकाः कथ्यन्ते । वेदानां विप्लावनात् नाशनात् तेऽवश्यं नरकं प्रयान्ति ।

सुकर्मणः सहस्रं ब्रह्माण्ड[2]पुराणे इदं वर्त्तते यदिन्द्रोऽनध्यायेषु यजुर्वेदमधीयानान् शिष्यान् वज्रेण जघानेति । तस्मादनध्यायेषु विद्या सर्वथा परिवर्जनीया एव ।

निवारणमुल्लंघ्य अनध्यायदिवसादिषु पठनपाठनाभ्यां पाठकस्य प्रज्ञामायुः प्रजां, श्रियं, बलं, वीर्य्यं, तेजः सर्वं स्वयं यमो[3] नाशयति । अनध्यायेषु वेदमन्त्राणां पठनपाठनाभ्यां मन्त्राणां शक्तिक्षयो

---

1. आयुः प्रज्ञां पशून् मेधां कृन्तामि सुकृतं च यत् ।
   अनध्यायेष्वभ्यस्यतो ब्रह्म व्याहरतस्तथा ॥
   स्मृतिचन्द्रिकायामुद्धृतो यमः, पृ. १६५
   अष्टमी हन्त्युपाध्याय शिष्यं हन्ति चतुर्दशी ।
   हन्ति पञ्चदशी मेधां तस्मात् सर्वाणि वर्जयेत् ॥
   धर्मसिन्धौ यमः, पृ. ४२४
   योऽर्थार्थीमान् द्विजे दद्यात् पठेदेवाविधानतः ।
   अनध्याये च तं प्राहु र्वेदविप्लावकं बुधाः ॥
   स्मृतिचन्द्रिकायां यमः पृ. १३७
   वेदविप्लावनात्तेन वरं मौनं समाश्रितम् ।
   वेदविप्लावनाद् विप्रो नरकं यात्यधोमुखः ॥, स्मृतिचन्द्रिकायां लघुव्यासः, पृ. १३७
2. प्रोवाचाथ सहस्रस्य सुकर्मा सूर्य्यवर्चसः ।
   अनध्यायेष्वधीयानान् तान् जघान शतक्रतुः ॥ , ब्रह्माण्डपुराणे, १.२.३५.३३
3. अनध्यायेष्वध्ययने प्रज्ञामायुः प्रजां श्रियम् ।
   ब्रह्म वीर्य्यं बलं तेजो निकृन्तति यमः स्वयम् ॥
   मन्त्रवीर्य्यक्षयभयादिन्द्रो वज्रेण हन्ति च ।
   ब्रह्म राक्षसतां चैति नरकञ्च भवेद् ध्रुवम् ॥, पारस्करगृह्यसूत्रम, २.१०.२३
   यमः सूत्रटीकायामुद्धृतः पृ. २५१

भवति, तस्मात् सुरपतिरिन्द्रो वज्रेण तं हन्ति । मृत्योरनन्तरं स ब्रह्मराक्षसो भवति नरकयातनां च लभते ।

प्रसिद्धस्मृतिकारः पराशरो[1]ऽपि अनध्यायस्य पालने महान्तमुपकारम् अपालने च महान्तमपकारं वर्णयति । येऽनध्यायविधिपालनपूर्वकं वेदादिकं पठन्ति पाठयन्ति वा, तेषां विद्याः फलप्रदा भवन्ति, ते इहलोके ऐश्वर्य्यसुखमनुभवन्ति । अपरे येऽनध्यायस्य विधिं समुल्लंघ्य पठन्ति, पाठयन्ति वा, तेषां विद्या सर्वथा निष्फला भवति । अविधिपूर्वकं समुच्चरिता वेदमन्त्रा वज्ररूपेण तानेव नाशयन्ति । तस्मादनध्यायः स्वार्थायापि सर्वथा पालनीय एवेति ।

स्मृतिचन्द्रिकायां समुद्धृते इन्द्रनारदसम्वादे[2]ऽपि अनध्यायस्य विधिं ये समुल्लंघ्य पठनं पाठनं वा कुर्वन्ति, ते जना दुरात्मानो ब्रह्मदूषका भवन्तीति कथितम् । तान् वज्रेण इन्द्रो नाशयतु इति नारदवचनं श्रुत्वा इन्द्रः कथयति यत् तेषामध्ययनं सर्वथा निष्फलं भवति, मृतास्ते स्वर्गं न यान्ति नरकं प्रयान्ति, जीवन्तोऽपि ते मृतप्रायाः । तेषां मृतानां कृते वज्रप्रहारं कथं करिष्यामि ?

---

1. यो वर्जयेदनध्यायान् वेदाध्ययनकृद् द्विजः ।
भवन्ति तस्य सफला वेदाः प्रोक्तफलप्रदाः ।
यः पठेद् विधिवद् वेदान् तद्व्रतोन्द्रियसंयमी ।
ब्रह्मत्वमिहलोकेऽपि ऐश्वर्य्यसुखभाग् भवेत् ॥
ये च तेषु पठन्त्यज्ञा पाठलोभेन लोभिताः ।
न शाश्वता भवेद् विद्या निष्फला च तथा द्विजः ॥
जनानां शृण्वतां यस्तु मार्गं गच्छन् पठेद् द्विजः ।
निष्फलास्तस्य वेदाश्च वेदविदेव दोषभाक् ॥
ये स्वाध्यायानधीयीरननध्यायेषु लोभतः ।
वज्ररूपेण ते मन्त्रास्तेषां देहे व्यवस्थिताः ॥
धर्मशास्त्रसंग्रहे उद्धृताः—बृहत्पराशरसंहिता ।

2. इन्द्रं प्रति नारदः —
अनध्यायेष्वधीयानान् किं शक्र न गतोऽसि तान् ।
असुरास्ते दुरात्मानो ब्रह्मघ्ना ब्रह्मदूषकाः ॥
नारदं प्रतीन्द्रः —
अनध्यायेष्वधीतं हि नाधीतं यदि वैदिकम् ।
मृताः स्वर्गं न गच्छन्ति किं नारद ! न ते हताः ॥
स्मृतिचन्द्रिकायामिन्द्रनारद-संवादे, पृ. १६५

एताः पूर्वोक्तास्तिथयो न केवलमतीव पवित्रे महत्त्वपूर्णेऽध्ययनाध्यापनरूपे कर्मणि निषिद्धा अपितु तादृशेऽतीवगुरुत्वपूर्णे सन्तानसृष्टिकारि-स्त्री-पुरुष-समागमे कर्मण्यपि निषिद्धा[1] भवन्ति।

स्त्रीणामृतुकाले समागमो यद्यपि समुचितस्तथापि ऋतुकालमध्ये पर्वदिवसेषु स्त्रीभिः सार्द्धं समागमो न कदापि करणीय एव। स्त्रीभिः सार्द्धं समागमे ऋतुकालेऽपि पर्वदिवसान् सर्वथा परिवर्जयेदिति भावः।

प्रतिपदादिषु तिथिषु अध्ययनेन चाध्यापनेन समुल्लिखितप्रकारेण गुरोः शिष्यस्य आयुःक्षयो बुद्धेर्विद्याया वा हानिः प्रत्यक्षं यद्यप्यस्माभिः नानुभूयते, तथापि न त्वेकस्य अपितु बहूनां त्रिकालदर्शिनां महर्षीणां वचनं कदाचिदपि नानृतं स्यादिति तेषां वचनेषु विश्वासपूर्वकं तैः प्रोक्ता अनध्याय-नियमाः सर्वदा सर्वथा च पालनीया एव, अध्ययनार्थं यदा सर्वे हितैषिणः प्रोत्साहयन्ति, तदा निर्दिष्टेषु तिथि-स्थान-समयेषु अध्ययनाद्यर्थं क्रियमाणे महर्षीणां निवारणे किमपि गूढं तत्त्वमवश्यं स्यादिति विश्वासः करणीयः वस्तुतस्तु यद् गूढं तत्त्वं तत्र तेषां निवारणे वर्तते, तद् ज्योतिःशास्त्रम् आधुनिकविज्ञानं च प्रकाशयतः।

साधारणभावेन विचारे क्रियमाणे, ज्ञायते यत् प्रतिपदादयः सर्वास्तिथयो भगवता चन्द्रेण, एकैव संक्रान्तितिथिः भगवता सूर्येण च सार्द्धं सम्बद्धा इति। भगवतश्चन्द्रस्यास्माकं मनोभिः सार्द्धं निविडः सम्बन्धो वर्तते। यथा भगवती सरस्वती विद्यायाः, यथा वा भगवती लक्ष्मी धनस्य चाधिष्ठात्री देवी भवति, तथैव भगवान् चन्द्रोऽस्माकं सर्वेषां मनसामधिष्ठाता देवो भवति। स्वयं चन्द्रस्तु सृष्ट्यादौ परमेश्वरस्य मनस एव जात इति भगवती श्रुतिः[2] समुद्घोषयति।

---

1. (पर्वसु) न मांसमश्नीयात् न स्त्रियमुपेयात्।

बौधायनधर्मसूत्रम्, १.११.२१.२०

नाष्टमी-चतुर्दशी-पञ्चदशीषु स्त्रियमुपेयात्।

विष्णुस्मृतिः, ६९.१

ऋतुकालाभिगामी स्यात् स्वदारनिरतः सदा।
पर्ववर्जं व्रजेच्चैनां तद्व्रतो रतिकाम्यया॥

मनुस्मृतिः, ३.४५

अमावास्यामष्टमीं च पौर्णमासीं चतुर्दशीम्।
ब्रह्मचारी भवेन्नित्यमप्यृतौ स्नातको द्विजः॥

मनुस्मृतिः, ४.१२८

4. "चन्द्रमा मनसो जात."—शुक्लयजुर्वेदः, ३१ १.१६.१२

भगवतः सूर्यस्य चन्द्रस्य च पृथिवीनिवासिनां न केवलं मनुष्याणामुपरि अपितु सर्वेषां प्राणिनां वृक्षादीनां चोपरि महान् प्रभावो[1] वर्तते। चन्द्रस्य प्रभावेण पूर्णिमायाममावास्यायां च समुद्राणां महान् जलराशिः सुतरां समुल्लसति। समुद्रजलेन सार्द्धमस्माकं शरीरस्थस्य रक्तस्य महद् साम्यं[2] वर्तते। तस्माद् चन्द्रस्य प्रभावेण अस्माकं शरीरस्थो रक्तराशिः समुल्लसति, तेनास्माकं शरीरे विक्रिया संजायते। चन्द्रस्तु उद्दीपनविभावरूपेण साहित्ये सर्वैः कविभिर्वर्ण्यते।

पूर्णिमायां तिथौ यथा पूर्णचन्द्रो दृश्यते, तथैव तद्पूर्वतिथौ चतुर्दश्यां, तद्परवर्त्तितिथौ प्रतिपदि च प्रायः पूर्णचन्द्रो दृश्यते। अमावास्यायां, तद्पूर्वचतुर्दश्यां, तद्परप्रतिपदि च चन्द्रः प्रायो न दृश्यते। तस्माद् पूर्णिमायाममावास्यायां च चन्द्रस्य अस्माकमुपरि यः प्रभावः, स एव प्रभावः पूर्वपरतिथिद्वये चतुर्दश्यां प्रतिपदि च प्रायशोऽनुभूयेत। तदर्थं हि तासु तिथिषु अध्ययनार्थमध्यापनार्थं वा निषेधो धर्मशास्त्रकारैः विहित इति ज्ञेयम्।

भगवतश्चन्द्रस्य प्रभावमधिकृत्य १९८२ तमे वर्षे जुनमासे कानपुरे समनुष्ठिते आलोचनाचक्रे विश्वविश्रुतो ज्योतिर्विद् ड० वि. भि. रमणमहोदयः चन्द्रस्य अस्माकमुपरि महान्तं प्रभावं बहुशास्त्राणि समुद्धृत्य प्रतिपादितवान्[3]। तेन प्रोक्तं यदस्माकं विशेषतो हिन्दूनां सर्वे उत्सवाः उपवासाः सर्वाणि व्रतानि

---

1. The sun and the moon, no doubt, have great influence over human beings as well as animals and plant world.

The Moon too, on account of its comparative proximity does exercise its influence not only on the Oceans of atmosphere and Oceans of water but on everything that is of the earth and of the water.

Astrological Magazine, Dec. 82 p. 898

2. The effect of the moon and the sun creates tides in the sea including the watermass of the earth. Human blood is likewise a fluid containing 80% sodium, 4% calcium, 4% potasium, while magnesium varies.

The moon's longitude has direct effect on human blood causing tides and regulating hormone secretions.

Planets and Forecast., March, 1983, p. 138

3. B. V. Raman, speaking as chief guest at the national convention on the Moon held at Kanpur on 20th June, 1982 narrated the importance of the moon to the Hindus in particular. All the Hindu feasts and fasts are regulated by the position of the moon. No wonder, the moon assumed great importance in Indian astronomy and astrology.

Astrological, Magazine, Sep. 1982 p. 668c.

च चन्द्रस्य स्थित्यनुसारं भवन्ति । भारतीये ज्योतिःशास्त्रे चन्द्रस्य सुमहान् प्रभावः परिलक्ष्यते इति तेन सोदाहरणं प्रतिपादितम् । पुनस्तेन प्रोक्तं यत् चन्द्रस्य प्रभावेण प्राणिनां जन्म, मृत्युः, केषांचित् रोगाणां वृद्धिः, मानसिकविक्रिया, भूमिकम्पादयश्च भवन्तीति[1] ।

भगवतश्चन्द्रस्य एतादृशं महान्तं प्रभावमस्मासु विज्ञाय एव अस्माकं त्रिकालदर्शिनो धर्मशास्त्रकारा अनध्यायस्य विधानं कृतवन्त इति ।

अस्माकं धर्मशास्त्रेषु प्रतिपादितं तत्त्वमिदं संप्रति चिकित्साविज्ञानेन प्रमाणितं भवति । पाटना-चिकित्सामहाविद्यालयस्य औषधविभागस्य प्राचार्यः डा० सि. पि. ठाकुर[2]महोदयेन स्वगवेषणाबलेन संप्रति प्रमाणीकृतं यत् पूर्णिमातिथौ विषभक्षणाय मानवानां मनसि कुप्रवृत्तिर्जायत इति ।

एतस्य कुप्रभावस्य कारणं[3] प्रदर्श्य सः कथयति-यदस्माकं शरीरेषु प्रतिशतं ५० भागेभ्यः ६० भागान् यावद् जलं वर्त्तते । पूर्णिमादिवसे समुद्रस्य विशालो जलराशिः चन्द्रस्य प्रभावेण यथा समुल्लसति, तथैव अस्माकं शरीरस्थो जलराशिरपि समुल्लसति, तेनास्माकं शरीरे जैवरसायनप्रक्रियायां विक्रिया संजायते । एतस्मादेव कारणात् स्वप्राणविनाशिनो विषस्यापि ग्रहणे प्राणिनां मनःसु कुप्रवृत्ति र्जायत[4] इति ।

---

1. RAMAN, further said—It is well known that births and deaths, aggravations of certain diseases and mental disorders, earthquakes and rainfalls are intimately related to the moon and his phases.

   Astrological Magazine, Sep. 1982, p. 668c.

2. C. P. THAKUR, Professor of Medicine, Patna Medical College, Patna has recently proved through his scientific investigations that evil tendency to take poison arises in the minds of the people on the full-moon day.

3. The reason according to THAKUR for such an evil tendency in human mind is that there is 50% to 60% of water in the human body. As the sea water on the full moon day rises due to the gravitational pull of the moon, so also the watermass in the human body rises on the fullmoon day and causes disorder in the bio-chemical process of the body. Therefore, the evil tendency for taking poison on the full-moon day, rises in the minds of the people.

4. एष महत्त्वपूर्णः सिद्धान्तः उत्कलभाषायाः विशिष्टे दैनिकसंवादपत्रे "समाजे" ६.५.८२ दिवसे प्रकाशितः ।

पूर्णिमादिवसे यथा कुप्रवृत्तिर्जायते, तथैव तत्पूर्वतिथौ चतुर्दश्यां, तत्परतिथौ प्रतिपदि प्राणिनां मानसेषु कीदृशी प्रतिक्रिया भवति, तस्मिन् विषये तस्यानुसंधानं प्रचलति। धर्मशास्त्रकाराणां पूर्णिमाविषये तत्त्वं यथा तेन प्रमाणीकृतं, तथैव प्रतिपदादिषु तिथिष्वपि धर्मशास्त्राणां तत्त्वं तस्यानुसन्धानेन प्रमाणितं भविष्यतीति दृढो विश्वासो वर्त्तते।

संप्रति अनेके धूमपानं कुर्वन्ति। चिकित्सकास्तु सदैव कथयन्ति यद् धूमपानं स्वास्थ्यस्य हानिकारकं भवति। चिकित्सकानामिदं सावधानवचनं[1] सिगारेटस्य (Cigarette) विज्ञापनफलके एव शोभनं लिखितं दृश्यते शास्त्रवचनरूपेण। तद् वचनमनादृत्य धूमपानंकृत्वा जना यथा स्वस्वास्थ्यहानिं कुर्वन्ति, तथा अनध्यायमधिकृत्य शास्त्रवचनानि श्रुत्वापि यदि तानि न पालयित्वा छात्रा आत्मनां महतीं हानिं कुर्वन्ति, तर्हि अस्माकं किमपि वक्तव्यं नास्ति।

---

1. Statutory warning—"Cigarette smoking is injurious for health."

सहायक ग्रन्थसूची

१. श्रीमद्भगवद्गीता, श्रीधरीव्याख्यासहिता, सपादकः, पण्डित कृष्णदत्तशास्त्री, संस्कृतपुस्तकालयः, बनारस।

२. मनुस्मृतिः, मणिप्रभा हिन्दीटीका, टीकाकारः, पण्डित श्री हरगोविन्द शास्त्री, चौखम्बा संस्कृत सीरिज, बनारस, १९५२।

३. मनुस्मृतिः, मेधातिथि-सर्वज्ञनारायण-कुल्लूक-राघवानन्द-नन्दन-रामचन्द्र-मणिराम-गोविन्दराज-भारुचि-इति व्याख्यानवकेन समलंकृता। द्वितीयो विभागः, संपादकः, जयन्तकृष्ण हरिकृष्ण दवे, भारतीय विद्याभवन, १९७५।

४. सूक्तिसुधाकरः सानुवादः, गीताप्रेस, गोरखपुर, संवत् २०११।

५. बौधायनधर्मसूत्रम्, गोविन्दस्वामिप्रणीत-विवरणसमेतम्, हिन्दी व्याख्याकार-श्री उमेशचन्द्र पाण्डेयः, चौखम्बा संस्कृत सीरिज अफिस, बनारस, १९७२ ।

६. धर्मसिन्धुः, श्री काशीनाथ उपाध्यायविरचितः, धर्मदीपिकाहिन्दीव्याख्यासुधाटिप्पणीयुतः धर्मदीपिकाकारः श्री वशिष्ठदत्त मिश्रः, सुधाटिप्पणीकारः,श्री सुदामा मिश्र शास्त्री, चौखम्बा संस्कृत सीरिज अफिस, वाराणसी, १९६८।

७. कृत्यकल्पतरुः, लक्ष्मीधरभट्टविरचितः, ब्रह्मचारिकाण्डम्, संपादकः-के. भि. रङ्गस्वामी आयङ्गार, बरोदा प्राच्यानुष्ठान (Oriental institute), १९४९ ।

८. याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृतिः, विज्ञानेश्वरस्य मिताक्षराटीकायुता, संपादकः, उमेशचन्द्र पाण्डेय, चौखम्बा संस्कृत सीरिज अफिस, वाराणसी, १९६७ ।

९. श्रीविष्णुस्मृतिः, नन्द पण्डित महोदयस्य केशव वैजयन्ती टीका भूषिता । संपादकः, भि. कृष्णमाचार्य, आड्यार पुस्तकागार-गवेषणाकेन्द्र (Adyar Library and Research Centre), आड्यार, माड्रास, १९६४ ।

१०. स्मृतिचन्द्रिका, देवणभट्टविरचिता, प्रथमः संस्कारकाण्डः, सर्वकारीय प्राच्य पुस्तकागार ग्रन्थमाला (Government Oriental Library Series No 43) महीशुर, १९१४ ।

११. श्रीमद्वाल्मीकिरामायणम्, संपादकः, पण्डित शिवराम शर्मा वाशिष्ठः, चौखम्बा विद्याभवन, वाराणसी, १९५७ ।

१२. धर्मशास्त्रसंग्रहः, संपादकः, वाचस्पति उपाध्यायः, नवदिल्ली, १९८२ ।

१३. पारस्कर गृह्यसूत्रम्, क्षेमराज श्रीकृष्ण दास श्रेष्ठिना मुम्बय्यां प्रकाशितम्, शकाब्दाः, १९५१ ।

१४. स्मृतीनां समुच्चयः, आनन्दराम संस्कृत ग्रन्थावलिः, ग्रन्थाङ्कः ४९ ।

१५. ब्रह्माण्ड-पुराणम्, संस्कर्ता, आचार्य जगदीश शास्त्री, मोतीलाल बनारसी दास, दिल्ली, १९७३ ।

१६. वाचस्पत्यम् (कोषः), सपादकः, तारानाथ तर्क वाचस्पतिः, प्रथमो भागः, चौखम्बा संस्कृत सीरिज अफिस, वाराणसी, १९६९ ।

17. *Sāṁkhyāyana gṛhya Sūtra*, Ed. OLDENBERG, *Indische Studien*. Vol. XV. Leipzig, 1978.

18. *Astrological Magazine*, Ed. B. V. RAMAN, Bangalore.

19. *Planets and Forecast*, Ed. Nimai BANERJEE, Pithapur, Cuttack.

N. Veezhinathan, Madras :

ब्रह्मणः शब्दावाच्यत्वम्

'तत्त्वमसि'[1] 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि'[2] इत्यादिवाक्यानि जीवत्वोपलक्षितेश्वरत्वोपलक्षितचिन्मात्रं प्रत्यगभिन्नं ब्रह्मस्वरूपं प्रतिपादयन्तीति निर्विशेषब्रह्मस्वरूपप्रतिपादनपराण्येव सर्वाण्यपि वेदान्तवाक्यानीति अद्वैतिनां सिद्धान्तः। तत्र त्वंपदेन जीवत्वोपलक्षितं चिन्मात्रम्, तत्पदेन सर्वज्ञत्वाद्युपलक्षितं चिन्मात्रं तत्त्वंपदाभ्यां प्रत्यगभिन्नं स्वरूपम् प्रतिपाद्यत इति वस्तुस्थितिः।

तत्र यद्यपि निर्विशेषं प्रत्यगात्मस्वरूपमीश्वरस्वरूपं च न त्वंपदस्य तत्पदस्य वा वाच्योऽर्थः, तथापि तत्त्वंपदाभ्यां आकाङ्क्षायोग्यतादिसहकारेण स्वाभिहितविशिष्टार्थाभिधानद्वारा तदभिहित-विशिष्टार्थगतवाक्यार्थानुभावकत्वरूपशक्तिविशेषेण लक्षणाख्येन वाक्यप्रामाण्यनिर्वाहार्थं तात्पर्यानुसारेणा-खण्डस्वरूपमात्रमन्यत्राप्रसिद्धमपि वाक्यमहिम्नैव बोध्यते। तत्र सत्यादिवाक्यैः स्वरूपलक्षणद्वारा अप्रसिद्धमपि निर्विशेषं बोधयितुं शक्यते--यथा 'गन्धवती पृथिवी, नित्यज्ञानाधार ईश्वर' इत्यादौ परमाण्वादे र्भूगोलान्तस्य ईश्वरस्य चाप्रसिद्धस्यापि बोधनम्।

सर्वेषु हि वाक्येषु पदानां स्वार्थोपस्थापनमात्रेण पर्यवसानं न तु वाक्यार्थानुभावकत्वपर्यन्तमपि व्यापारः। पदाभिहितानामेव तु पदार्थानां लक्षणया तात्पर्यानुसारेण वाक्यार्थस्य लक्षणम्।
तदुक्तम् —

'वाक्यार्थो लक्ष्यमाणो हि सर्वत्रैवेति नः स्थितम्'[3] इति। एवम् अप्रमेयस्य (प्रमाणान्तरा-प्रसिद्धस्य) पदान्तरावाच्यस्य च ब्रह्मणः लक्षणा संभवत्येव। इक्ष्वादिमाधुर्यविशेषस्य साक्षाद्वक्तु-मशक्यस्यापि लक्ष्यत्वात्। तदुक्तं भामत्याम् —

'न खलु इक्षुक्षीरगुडादीनां मधुररसभेदाः शक्याः सरस्वत्याप्याख्यातुम्'[4] इति। न हि प्रमाणान्तरप्रसिद्धार्थस्यैव पदेनोपस्थापनमिति वैदिकेषु वाक्येषु द्वैतविशिष्टाद्वैतादिवादिनामप्ययेकान्तः। सगुणब्रह्मवैकुण्ठादिलोकादीनामप्रसिद्धानामपि तत्तत्पदैरुपस्थापनस्य तैस्तैरङ्गीकरणात्। तत्र यदि तत्तत्प्रकरणनिर्गलितवाक्यार्थ एव तेन तेन पदेन तत्र विवक्ष्यते, तर्हि सर्वप्रकरणनिर्गलितत्वेनाध्यारो-पापवादन्यायेन निर्विशेषब्रह्मणोऽपि तत्र तत्र बोधनं कथं दण्डेन वार्यते? एवं 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते'[5] इति श्रुतेरिदन्तया ब्रह्म केनापि पदेन घटादिवद् न मुख्यतया वाच्यम्। यस्तु यत्र तत्र ब्रह्मशब्दः अन्ये च

सत्यज्ञानादयः शब्दाः ते सर्वे लक्षणयैव ब्रह्म बोधयन्ति न ते मुख्यवृत्त्या इति अद्वैतिनां सिद्धान्तः। अयमेव विषयः प्रमाणोपपत्तिपूर्वाचार्यग्रन्थसंवादादिभिः अस्मिन् निबन्धे प्रतिपाद्यते।

तैत्तिरीयोपनिषदि आनन्दवल्ल्यां नवमेऽनुवाके—'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह। आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्। न बिभेति कुतश्चनेति'[6] इत्याम्नायते। एवं तत्रैव चतुर्थानुवाके 'न बिभेति कदाचनेति'[7] इत्यानुपूर्वीकं पठ्यते। तत्र नवमानुवाकव्याख्यानावसरे शाङ्करे भाष्ये—

'यतः यस्मात् निर्विकल्पात् यथोक्तलक्षणात् अद्वयात् आनन्दात्मनः वाचः अभिधानानि द्रव्यादिसविकल्पवस्तुविषयाणि वस्तुसामान्यान्निर्विकल्पे अद्वयेऽपि ब्रह्मणि प्रयोक्तृभिः प्रकाशनाय प्रयुज्यमानानि अप्राप्य अप्रकाश्यैव निवर्तन्ते स्वसामर्थ्याद्धीयन्ते। मन इति प्रत्ययो विज्ञानम्। .. ...तस्मात् सहैव वाङ्मनसयोः अभिधानप्रत्यययोः प्रवृत्तिः सर्वत्र। तस्मात् ब्रह्मप्रकाशनाय सर्वथा प्रयोक्तृभिः प्रयुज्यमाना अपि शब्दाः यस्मात् निवर्तन्ते'[8] इत्याद्यनुगृहीतम्। अत्र भाष्ये स्वसामर्थ्याद्धीयन्त इत्यनेन पदशक्तिविषयत्वमेव निषेध्यत्वेनाभिप्रेतम्, न तु लक्षणाविषयत्वमपि। अन्यथा 'तं त्वौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि'[9] इत्युपनिषत्प्रकाश्यत्वश्रुतिविरोधप्रसङ्गात्। अत्र मनः पदेन वाच इत्यनेन समभिव्याहारात् शब्दशक्तिजनितं विज्ञानमुच्यते। यत्र शब्दशक्तिविषयत्वं प्रथममेव प्रवृत्तमस्ति तत्र तदनु शब्दशक्तिजनितविज्ञानविषयत्वमपि भवति। तदुभयमपि सविशेषस्यैव वस्तुनः। निर्विशेषस्य तु शब्दशक्तिविषयत्वमपि नास्ति अत एव तज्जनितज्ञानविषयत्वमपि नास्तीति श्रुत्यर्थो भाष्याभिप्रेतः। तदुक्तं वार्तिके—

"उदपादि च यच्छब्दैर्ज्ञानमाकारवद्धियः।
स्वतोबुद्धं तदप्राप्य नाम्ना सहनिवर्तते॥"[10] इति।

धियः अन्तःकरणस्य परिणामरूपं सप्रकारं यत् ज्ञानं शब्दैः शक्त्या उत्पादितं तत् स्वयंप्रकाशं ब्रह्म अप्रकाश्यैव नाम्ना सह निवर्तत इति वार्तिकार्थः। सविशेष प्रकाशने समर्थस्यापि शब्दशक्तिजनितविज्ञानस्य निर्विशेषब्रह्मप्रकाशनयोग्यता नास्तीति फलितम्। एतच्च—'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्'[11] इत्यादिप्रथमानुवाक व्याख्यानावसरे भाष्ये स्पष्टीकृतम्। तथा हि तत्र भाष्यम्—

'तस्मादेव च न ज्ञानशब्दवाच्यमपि ब्रह्म। तथापि तदाभासवाचकेन बुद्धिधर्मविषयेण ज्ञानशब्देन तल्लक्ष्यते, न तूच्यते, शब्दप्रवृत्तिहेतुजात्यादिधर्मरहितत्वात्, सत्यानन्तशब्दाभ्यां सामानाधिकरण्यात्। तथा सत्यशब्देनापि। सर्वविशेषप्रत्यस्तमितस्वरूपत्वात् ब्रह्मणः। बाह्यसत्तासामान्यविषयेण सत्यशब्देन लक्ष्यते सत्यं ब्रह्मेति न तु सत्यशब्दवाच्यं ब्रह्म। अतः सिद्धम् 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते

अप्राप्य मनसा सह' 'अनिरुक्तेऽनिलयने' इति च अवाच्यत्वम्, नीलोत्पलवद् अवाक्यार्थत्वं च ब्रह्मणः'[12] इति।

अत्र ब्रह्मणः शब्दावाच्यत्वे जात्यादिधर्मराहित्यं हेतुं वदद्भिः आचार्यैः पातञ्जलमहाभाष्य-वचनमनुसंहितम्। तथा हि ऋलृक् सूत्रे महाभाष्यम् 'चतुष्टयी शब्दानां प्रवृत्तिः जातिशब्दाः गुणशब्दाः क्रियाशब्दा यदृच्छाशब्दाश्चतुर्थाः'[13] इति। शब्दानामर्थे या प्रवृत्तिः सा प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तभेदाद् प्रकारचतुष्टय-वतीत्यर्थः इति तत्र उद्योतः।[14]

जात्यादिधर्मराहित्ये हेतुः 'सत्यानन्तशब्दाभ्यां सामानाधिकरण्यमि'ति। बाधायोग्यत्वत्रिविध-परिच्छेदराहित्यसमर्पकाभ्यां सत्यानन्तशब्दाभ्यां ब्रह्मणो निर्विशेषत्वावगमादित्यर्थः। तथा च ब्रह्मणः शब्दावाच्यत्वमाचार्याणामभिप्रेतमिति स्पष्टम्। वार्तिककाराणामप्यभिप्रेतमेतद्—

'शब्दप्रवृत्तिहेतूनां प्रत्यगात्मन्यसंभवात्।
शब्दार्थासंभवं प्राह ह्यप्राप्येत्यादराच्छ्रुतिः॥[15]
यतो वाचोऽभिधानानि प्रयुक्तान्युपलब्धये।
सर्वाण्यनभिधायैव निवर्तन्तेऽवबोध्य च॥[16]

इति वदताम्। षष्ठीगुणक्रियाजातिरूढयः शब्दप्रवृत्तिहेतवः। तेषां ब्रह्मण्यसंभवात् शब्दार्थासंभवः शब्दवाच्यत्वासंभवः इति टीका।

ब्रह्मणः शब्दवाच्यत्वाभावे शास्त्रप्रमाणकत्वं कथम् इत्याशङ्कानिवृत्तये द्वितीयश्लोकः। शक्त्यभावेऽपि लक्षणया शास्त्रबोध्यत्वं ब्रह्मणः अनभिधायेत्यनेन शक्त्यभाव उक्तः, अवबोध्य चेत्यनेन लक्षणया बोधः सूचितः। वार्तिककारैरेव नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धावपि—

षष्ठीगुणक्रियाजातिरूढयः शब्दहेतवः।
नात्मन्यन्यतमोऽमीषां तेनात्मा नाभिधीयते॥[17]

इत्युक्तम्। षष्ठीशब्देन षष्ठीवाच्यः संबन्धो विवक्षितः। क्वचित् संबन्धः शब्दप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तं यथा राजपुरुष इत्यादिः। क्वचित् गुणयोगः यथा शुक्लः पट इत्यादिः। क्वचित् क्रियायोगः यथा पाचक इत्यादिः। क्वचिज्जातियोगः यथा गौरश्वः पुरुष इत्यादिः। क्वचिद्रूढिर्यथा आकाशो द्यौरभ्रमित्यादिः। एतेषां शब्दप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तानामन्यस्यापि असङ्गे अगुणे अविक्रिये असामान्ये प्रमाणान्तरायोग्यत्वेनागृहीतसंबन्धे चात्मन्यभावात् आत्मा नाभिधेय इत्यर्थः।

आत्मनः परमार्थतः पदेन सह वाच्यवाचकलक्षणसंबन्धाभावे पदविषयत्वाभावाद् वाक्याद् सम्यग्बोधोत्पत्तिर्न स्यादित्याशङ्कायामुक्तम्—

असत्ये वर्त्मनि स्थित्वा निरूपायमुपेयते ।
आत्मतत्त्वकारणाद्विद्वो गुणवृत्त्या विबोधिताः ॥ [18] इति ।

असत्ये आरोपितरूपे वर्त्मन्युपाये शबलात्मनि स्थित्वा निरूपायं सत्ताप्रतीतौ साक्षादुपायरहितमात्मतत्त्वमुपेयते-प्राप्यते । शब्दाद् शबलात्मस्वरूपं मुख्यवृत्या बोध्यते, ततो लक्षणया आत्मतत्त्वप्रतीतिरित्यर्थः ।

उपायमात्रस्योपेयेन सत्यसंबन्धरहितस्य बोधकत्वेऽपि वाचकशब्दस्यागृहीतसंबन्धस्य बोधकत्वं क्वापि न दृश्यत इत्याशङ्क्य संबन्धग्रहणमन्तरेणापि बोधकत्वं सदृष्टान्तमुपपादयति—

शयानाः प्रायशो लोके बोध्यमानाः स्वनामभिः ।
सहसैव प्रबुध्यन्ते यथैवं प्रत्यगात्मवि ॥ [19] इति ।

यथा निद्रितः पुमान् 'उत्तिष्ठ देवदत्त' त्यामन्त्रणशब्देन अगृह्यमाणसंबन्धेनैव बोध्यमानः प्रबुध्यते तद्वद् तत्त्वमस्यादिना अविद्यया निद्रितः पुमान् अगृह्यमाणसंबन्धेनैव बोध्यमानः प्रबुध्यत इत्यर्थः ।

ननु तत्र नामभिः पूर्वगृहीतसंबन्धस्मरणमस्त्येव, तस्मात् गृहीतसंबन्धानामेव तेषां बोधकत्वमित्यत आह—

न हि नाम्नाऽस्ति संबन्धो व्युत्थितस्य शरीरतः ।
तथापि बुध्यते तेन यथैवं तत्त्वमित्यतः ॥ [20] इति ।

शरीराद् व्युत्थितस्य—देहेन्द्रियाभिमानरहितस्य सुषुप्तस्य स्ववाचकशब्दश्रवणसंबन्धस्मरणयोरभावात् तयोर्भावे च शरीरसंबन्धे सति प्रतिबोधः प्रतिबोधे सति शरीरसंबन्धः इत्यन्योन्याश्रयप्रसङ्गाद् अस्मर्यमाणसंबन्धस्यैव बोधकत्वं सुषुप्तावङ्गीकार्यम् । तस्माद्वाचकशब्दस्य वाच्य एव संबन्धज्ञानापेक्षा न लक्ष्ये । अन्यत्र गृहीतसंबन्धस्यापि गङ्गाशब्दस्य संबन्धग्रहणं विनैव तीरादौ बुद्धिजनकत्वदर्शनात् । एव शबले गृहीतसंबन्धानामपि तत्त्वमस्यादिशब्दानां लक्षणया अखण्डैकरसपर्यवसायित्वं नानुपपन्नमिति ज्ञानोत्तमाचार्याः विवृण्वन्ति स्म । [21]

विमुक्तात्मविरचितायामिष्टसिद्धौ च शब्दाद्वैतनिराकरणप्रकरणे 'तच्च ब्रह्म आत्मादिशब्दैर्लक्ष्यते न तूच्यते ज्ञायते वा यतो वाचो निवर्तन्त इत्यादिश्रुते'[22] रित्यादिना ब्रह्मणः शब्दावाच्यत्वं

स्पष्टीकृतम् । पञ्चपादिका विवरणे च "जगत्कारणसामान्यानुवादेन तत्र ज्ञानानन्दशब्दौ आनन्दविशेषं गमयतः एकसत्यानन्तशब्दाः भेदमिथ्यात्वद्वैताभावाभिधानद्वारेण तत्र लक्षणया वर्तन्ते । सर्वज्ञः सर्वशक्तिरित्यादिशब्दाश्च अनिर्वचनीयप्रपञ्चोपाधितया तत्र वर्तन्ते । 'अयमात्मा', 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यादि शब्दाश्च मुख्यलक्षणाभ्यां ब्रह्मण्येव वर्तन्त इति सर्वे जगत्कारणविषयाः शब्दामुख्यलक्षणोपाधिभिः एकरसमेव ब्रह्म प्रतिपादयन्ति"[23] इत्युक्तम् । तत्र मुख्यलक्षणाभ्यामित्यस्य जहदजहल्लक्षणयेति विवरणं तात्पर्यदीपिकायां[24] कृतम् । तत्र ज्ञानानन्दशब्दौ व्यक्त्यंशापरित्यागेन मुख्यवृत्त्या वर्तेते । एकादिशब्दाः जहल्लक्षणया वर्तन्ते, तत्त्वमसीत्यादयो मुख्यलक्षणाभ्याम्, सर्वज्ञत्वादयः उपाधित इति द्रष्टव्यमिति तात्पर्यदीपिका ।[25]

तत्र भावप्रकाशिकाकाराः नृसिंहाश्रमिणः प्राहुः 'न तावदात्मादिशब्दानां सत्यज्ञानानन्दात्मके ब्रह्मणि शक्तिः संभवति । तत्तत्पदघटितवाक्यार्थत्वात् । न हि तत्तद्वाक्यप्रतिपाद्यं तदेकदेशपदशक्यं भवति । सहश्रुतपदानां संभूयबोधकताव्युत्पत्तिविरोधप्रसङ्गात् । एकैकपदात् यावद्ब्रह्मस्वरूपाप्रतीतेश्च । पदान्तरवैयर्थ्यप्रसङ्गाच्च । किं चैवमविशेषात् सर्वेषां तत्र शक्तौ पर्यायतापत्तिरिति प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तभेदो वक्तव्यः । तथा च धर्ममात्रं विशिष्टं वा शक्यमिति नैकस्यापि पदस्य वाक्यतात्पर्यगोचरे ब्रह्मणि शक्तिः । क्लृप्तशक्त्यनुरोधेन लक्षणया पदानां तद्बोधकत्वसंभवे शक्तिकल्पनायोगाच्च ।

'ननु कस्यापि पदस्य तत्र शक्त्यभावे कथं तल्लक्षणा स्यात्, पदान्तरवाच्यस्यैव लक्ष्यत्वात् । किञ्च वाच्यसंबन्धितया लक्ष्यस्यावगमो वक्तव्यः । स चावगमो ब्रह्मणि न नामान्तरेण, औपनिषदे तद्प्रवृत्तेरिति शब्दादेव वाच्यम् । सोऽपि लाक्षणिकश्चेत् अनवस्थया न कस्यापि पदस्य लक्षणा सिध्यतीति चेत्'[26] 'न तावत् अभिधेयमेव लक्ष्यमिति राजनियोगः । लक्ष्येऽनात्मत्ववत् अभिधेयत्वस्याप्यप्रयोजकत्वात्' इत्यादिना ब्रह्मणः अवाच्यत्वं लक्ष्यत्व चोपपादितम् ।[27]

संक्षेपशारीरकेऽपि—

षष्ठीजातिगुणक्रियादिरहिते सर्वस्य विज्ञातरि
प्रत्यक्षे परिवर्जिताखिलजगद्वैतप्रपञ्चे दृशौ ।
सन्त्यक्तव्यवधानके परमके विष्णोः पदे शाश्वते
त्वय्यज्ञानविनिर्मिते न हि गिरो मुख्यप्रवृत्तिक्षमाः ॥[28]

इति श्लोकेन संबन्धः जातिः गुणः क्रिया चेति चत्वारि शब्दस्य मुख्यवृत्तौ निमित्तानि। अद्वितीये एकव्यक्तिरूपे निर्गुणे निष्क्रिये च ब्रह्मणि तेषां चतुर्णामपि निमित्तानामभावात् न ब्रह्मणः शब्दवाच्यत्वमित्युपपादितम्।

आस्तामत्र वचः प्रवृत्तिविरहः प्रत्यक्त्वहेतोर्दृशि
व्यापाराय मनोऽपि न प्रभवति भ्राम्यत्पराग्भूमिषु।

एवं चेदखिलप्रमाणपदवीः षोढा विभिन्ना भवान्
उल्लङ्घ्य व्यवतिष्ठते त्वयि गिरः स्यान्मुख्यवृत्तिः कथम्।[29]

इति श्लोकेन प्रमाणान्तरविषयस्यैव मुख्यवृत्तिविषयत्वम् प्रमाणान्तराविषयस्य ब्रह्मणः शब्दवाच्यत्वं नैव संभवतीति उपपादितम्।

पदार्थतत्त्वनिर्णयेऽपि—

'नन्वागमादि संसृष्टे विषये प्रमाणम्' इति प्रक्रम्य, 'अतोऽद्वितीयं चिदेकरसमागमस्यानुमानस्य वा न गोचरः। लक्षणया लक्ष्यार्थत्वं सत्यज्ञानादिपदानां संभवतीति चेत्-न। मानान्तरगम्यस्य पदान्तरवाच्यस्य च लक्ष्यत्वनियमात्। अन्यथा लक्ष्यनिर्देशो न स्यात्। इदं लक्ष्यमिति लक्षणान्तरेण लक्ष्यनिर्देशे चानवस्थाप्रसङ्गः। किञ्च अजहल्लक्षणायां सत्यादिविशिष्टं ब्रह्म लक्ष्यं स्यात्। जहल्लक्षणायां तु असत्याज्ञानादिविशिष्टं लक्ष्यं भवेत्। भागत्यागलक्षणा (जहदजहल्लक्षणा) तु अत्र न संभवति सत्यज्ञानादेर्निर्भागत्वात्। एवम् अनुमानस्यापि प्रमाणसिद्धधर्म्यादिसंसृष्टमेव विषयः अन्यथा असिद्ध्यादिदोषप्रसङ्गात्'[30] इत्यादिपूर्वपक्षमुद्भाव्य—

'न कश्चिदपि दोषोऽस्मिन् पक्षे संभवति। तथा हि न तावत् पदान्तरवाच्यस्यैव लक्ष्यता, इक्ष्वादिमाधुर्यविशेषस्य साक्षाद्वक्तुमशक्यस्यापि लक्ष्यत्वात्। न तत्र लक्षणापीति चेन्न। तत्रेत्यनुवादानुपपत्तेः। एवं न लक्ष्यस्य मानविषयत्वनियमोऽपि। सुषुप्तावलौकिकानन्दस्य लक्षणया 'सुखमहमस्वाप्सम्' इति व्यपदेशदर्शनात्। न हि तत्र मुख्याशब्दवृत्तिः संभवेत्। तस्य मानागोचरत्वात्। ब्रह्मणि लक्षणान्तरासंभवेऽपि संभवत्येव जहदजहल्लक्षणा।'[31] इति निरूपितम्। न्यायरत्नदीपावल्यामपि—

'यत्तु मतं पदान्तरवाच्यं ज्ञेयं च लक्ष्यम्, अतो न ब्रह्म लक्ष्यमिति, तदसत् तथा हि इक्षुक्षीरमाधुर्यविशेषोऽवाच्योऽपि लक्ष्यते। नात्र लक्षणापीति चेन्न। अत्रेत्यनुवादाभावप्रसङ्गात्। एवं लक्ष्यस्य न मेयत्वनियमोऽपि। स्वापे ह्यमेयमेव सुखं लक्ष्यम्। लक्षणाविशेषोऽपि भागत्यागरूपस्तावद्युज्यते। सभागत्वं च लौकिकानन्दस्य अन्तःकरणवृत्त्यवच्छिन्नत्वेन सिद्धम्। अन्यथा कथं ब्रह्मस्वरूपानन्दस्य मात्राश्रुतिः—'एतस्यैवानन्दस्य अन्यानि भूतानि मात्रामुपजीवन्ति' इत्युपपद्यते।

..........न च भागत्यागलक्षणा अप्रसिद्धा, सोऽयमित्यत्रास्या अवश्याभ्युपेयत्वात्' [32] इत्युपपादितम्। आकृतिशक्तिवादिनो मीमांसकाः शब्दावाच्यमपि व्यक्तिविशेषं लक्षणयैव घटमानयेत्यादाववगच्छन्ति।

सिद्धान्तलेशसंग्रहे च – शाब्दापरोक्षनिरूपणसंदर्भे न चैवं 'यद्वाचानभ्युदितम्' इति शब्दस्यापि तत्करणत्वं निषिध्यत इति शङ्क्यम्। मनःकरणत्ववादिनामपि शब्दस्य निर्विशेषे परोक्षज्ञानकरणत्वस्याभ्युपगतत्वेन तस्य 'यतो वाच' इति श्रुत्यनुरोधेन शब्दार्थप्राप्तिरूपशक्तिमुखेन शब्दस्य तत्करणत्वनिषेधे तात्पर्यस्य वक्तव्यतया शक्यसंबन्धरूप लक्षणामुखेन तस्य तत्करणत्वाविरोधात्' [33] इत्यवादि। तद्व्याख्यायां च—शब्दस्य शक्त्या ब्रह्मज्ञानकरणत्वनिषेधपरं तद्वचनम्, न तु लक्षणयापि तत्करणत्वनिषेधपरम्, औपनिषदत्व श्रुतेर्निरालम्बनत्वप्रसङ्गात्' [34] इति।

एवं सिद्धान्ते स्थिते न्यायामृतकाराः ब्रह्मणः शब्दावाच्त्वे बहून् दोषान् प्रादर्शयन्। तेषां क्रमशः समाधानं पश्यामः—

[१]

ब्रह्म शब्दावाच्यमिति वदता भवता किम् अवाच्यमिति पदेन तत् शक्त्या प्रतिपाद्यते अथवा लक्षणया? आद्ये ब्रह्मणः अवाच्यशब्दवाच्यत्वात् अवाच्यत्वं न सिध्यति। द्वितीये अवाच्यशब्दस्य ब्रह्म लक्ष्यमित्यायातम्। तर्हि तस्य मुख्योऽर्थः कः? ब्रह्मातिरिक्तं न हि किमपि शब्दावाच्यमस्ति। सत्त्वे वा यथा तीरं गङ्गापदवाच्यप्रवाहसंबन्धि तथा अवाच्यरूपमुख्यार्थसंबन्धि ब्रह्म इत्येतावन्मात्रमुक्तं स्यात्। न हि तावता ब्रह्मणः अवाच्यत्वं सिध्येत्। यदि तु अवाच्यपदस्य मुख्यार्थ एव कश्चिन्नास्ति, अथापि स ब्रह्मलक्षक इति मन्येत तदा घटपदमपि घटलक्षकं स्यात्। न च घटपदेन घटरूपार्थस्य लक्ष्यत्वे घटपदवाच्यमुख्यार्थस्यान्यस्याभावात् न घटलक्षकत्वं घटपदस्येति वाच्यम्। तथा सति अवाच्यपदमुख्यार्थस्याभावात् अवाच्यपदमपि न ब्रह्मलक्षकमिति तुल्यत्वात् इति प्रथमः आक्षेपः। [35]

तत्र समाधानम्। अवाच्यपदस्य समासत्वेन समासे च विशिष्टशक्त्यनङ्गीकारात् अवाच्यशब्दस्य नास्ति शक्यार्थः कोऽपि। अतः वाच्यशब्दस्य शक्यमित्यर्थः। नञो भेदोऽर्थः। भेदे च वाच्यपदार्थस्य प्रतियोगितासंबन्धेनान्वयः। तथा च अवाच्यमिति समासेन वाच्यप्रतियोगिको भेद इति बोधो जायते। तादृशबोधविषयो यो वाच्यभेदः तत्संबन्धः पुरस्कृत्य अवाच्यपदस्य ब्रह्मणि लक्षणा। न हि स्वशक्यसंबन्ध एव लक्षणा। अर्थवादेषु वाक्यरूपेषु शक्त्यभावेन शक्यार्थविरहात्

शक्यसंबन्धरूपलक्षणायाः प्राशस्त्यादावसंभवात् 'गभीरायां नद्यां घोष' इत्यादिवाक्ये लक्षणाया अनुपपत्तेश्च। अपि तु स्वबोध्यार्थसंबन्धो लक्षणा। अत उक्तरीत्या अवाच्यपदस्यापि स्वबोध्यसंबन्धरूपा लक्षणा ब्रह्मणि संभवत्येवेति।[36]

[२]

'निर्विशेषं' 'परमार्थसत्', 'स्वप्रकाशमि'त्यादिशब्दैः ब्रह्म उच्येत चेत् ब्रह्मणः वाच्यत्वात्वापत्तिः। लक्ष्यते चेत् निर्विशेषस्वप्रकाशादिरूपस्य वाच्यार्थस्यान्यस्याभावात् लक्षणाया अनुपपत्तिः। वाच्यार्थसंबन्धस्यैव लक्षणारूपत्वात्। एवं लक्ष्यमिति शब्देन ब्रह्मोच्यते चेत् ब्रह्मणः वाच्यत्वापत्तिः। लक्ष्यते चेत् गङ्गापदलक्ष्यस्य तीरस्य अगङ्गात्ववत् लक्ष्यपदलक्ष्यस्य ब्रह्मणोऽलक्ष्यत्वमेव स्यात् इति द्वितीयः आक्षेपः।[37]

तत्समाधानम्—समस्तयोः निर्विशेषस्वप्रकाशपदयोः शक्यार्थविरहेऽपि बोध्यार्थं विशेषाभावादिकमादाय तत्संबन्धिनि ब्रह्मणि लक्षणायाः संभवात्। यदुक्तं ब्रह्मणः लक्ष्यपदेनापि लक्ष्यत्वे तीरस्यागङ्गात्ववत् ब्रह्मणोऽलक्ष्यत्वापत्तिरिति, तत्रोच्यते—लक्ष्यशब्दस्य लक्षधातोः ण्यत्प्रत्ययेन कृदन्तवृत्तिरूपतया शक्यार्थः नास्ति। अतः धातोः लक्षणा अर्थः ण्यत्प्रत्ययस्य संबन्धोऽर्थः। लक्षणासंबन्धः लक्ष्यशब्दबोध्यार्थः तत्संबन्धात् ब्रह्मणः लक्ष्यशब्दलक्ष्यत्वम्। अथवा धातोः लक्षणाजन्यधीरर्थः। प्रत्ययस्य विषयत्वमर्थः। तदाश्रये ब्रह्मणि बोध्यसंबन्धरूपा लक्षणा आश्रीयते। एवं च लक्षणासंबन्धरूपस्य वा लक्षणाजन्यबोधविषयत्वरूपस्य वा लक्ष्यत्वस्य लक्ष्यशब्दलक्ष्यत्वस्य च ब्रह्मण्युपपत्तिः। नैवं गङ्गापद इति वैलक्षण्यम्। वस्तुतः निर्धर्मके ब्रह्मणि लक्ष्यत्वमपि नाङ्गीक्रियतेऽस्माभिः। ब्रह्मणि लक्ष्यमिति पूर्वाचार्यव्यवहारस्तु वाच्यत्वाभावनिबन्धनः। न चैवं लक्ष्यत्वाभावनिबन्धनः वाच्यमिति व्यवहारोऽप्यस्तु इति वाच्यम्। इष्टत्वात्।[38] अत एव संक्षेपशारीरके—

आत्मानं न तु कर्मतामुपनयन् शब्दो वदेल्लक्षणा—
मार्गेणापि यतः पराग्विषयवन्नास्येष्यते कर्मता।
प्रत्यक्ता हि विरुध्यते यदि भवेदस्यात्मनः कर्मता
यद्यत्कम न तस्य तस्य भवति प्रत्यक्त्वभावो यतः॥[39]

प्रत्यग्रूपमतो न शब्दविषयो बुद्धेरवेद्यं यतो
बुद्धिर्यत्र हि वर्तते स विषयः शब्दस्य नात्मन्यसौ।
तेनात्मानमसौ न गोचरयितुं शब्दः क्षमो मुख्यया
वृत्त्यैवेतरयापि तेन न तया तस्यात्मनः कर्मता॥[40]

इति श्लोकाभ्यां ब्रह्मणः शब्दवाच्यत्वं शब्दलक्ष्यत्वमुभयमपि नास्तीति प्रत्यपादि । अयं तु प्रौढिवाद इति भाति । यतः इतरेषु ग्रन्थेषु सिद्धावेव अन्यत्र च ब्रह्मणः लक्ष्यत्वमेव प्रतिपादितम् ।

[३]

विशेषाभावोपलक्षितत्वादिकं वा तद्विशिष्टत्वं वा निर्विशेषादिशब्दवाच्यम्, तच्च न ब्रह्म । किन्तु तदाश्रयव्यक्तिभूतं विशेष्यम्, तदेव लक्ष्यं ब्रह्म । एवं च मुख्यार्थसिद्धिः, ब्रह्मणो निर्विशेषादिशब्द-लक्ष्यत्वेऽपि निर्विशेषत्वाद्यहानिश्चेति समाधानं न युज्यते । व्यक्तिः शब्दार्थः जातिस्तु शक्तिग्रहाधिकरणी-भूतव्यक्त्यनुगमकमिति मते जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिः शब्दार्थ इति मते च यत्र विशेष्ये निर्विशेषत्वादिकं तस्य तद्वाच्यत्वायोगात् । एतदनुपपत्तिपरिहाराय जातिः शब्दार्थः तदाश्रयव्यक्तिर्लक्ष्येति मताङ्गीकारे घटादिव्यक्तेरपि घटादिशब्दावाच्यत्वेन ब्रह्मणोऽपि तद्वत् सत्यादि पदावाच्यत्वे ततो विशेषाभावप्रसङ्गे न तदर्थं घटादेर्मुख्यार्थसंबन्धित्वेन लक्ष्यत्वं ब्रह्मणस्तु मुख्यार्थाश्रयव्यक्तिसंबन्धित्वेन लक्ष्यत्वमिति स्वीकारे मञ्चत्वाधारमञ्चस्थव्यक्तिसंबन्धिषु पुरुषेषु अमञ्चत्ववत् ब्रह्मणोऽपि सत्यत्वाभाव-निर्विशेषत्वाभावादिकं दुर्वारम् ।[41]

न च घटादितुल्यतयैव सत्यं ज्ञानमित्यादौ ब्रह्मणः सत्यत्वादिधर्माश्रयतयैव लक्ष्यत्वमस्तु इति वाच्यम् । तथा सति ब्रह्मणः घटादिवत् सखण्डार्थत्वापत्तेः इति तृतीय आक्षेपः ।

तत्समाधानम्—

कल्पितचन्द्रत्वादिजातियुक्तस्य चन्द्रादौ कल्पितद्वितीयचन्द्रादेः परमार्थचन्द्रादिव्यक्ति-तादात्म्येन अचन्द्रत्वाभाववत् अत्रापि कल्पितसत्ताश्रयस्य परमार्थसति ब्रह्मणि कल्पितत्वेन तत्रापि सत्ताद्याश्रयत्वव्यवहारः, परमार्थतस्तु न तस्य सत्ताश्रयत्वम्, किन्तु त्रिकालाबाध्य सत्तास्वरूपत्वमिति न सखण्डार्थत्वापत्तिरिति ।[42]

[४]

यदुक्तं अवाच्यादिशब्दाः समासरूपाः लक्ष्यादिशब्दाः यौगिकाः । अत उभयेषां वाक्यतुल्यत्वात् न वाचकत्वमिति । तन्न । अन्विताभिधानपक्षे पदानामन्विताभिधायकत्वाङ्गीकारेण अन्वयस्य वाच्यत्वाङ्गीकारात् पदसमुदायात्मकानां समासानां यौगिकपदानां च वाचकत्वात् । पदैरभिहिता पदार्था एवान्वयं बोधयन्तीति अभिहितान्वयवादिमते यद्यपि समासस्य यौगिकस्य वा वाक्यरूपस्य नान्वयवाचकत्वं न वा तल्लक्षकत्वम्, मुख्यवृत्तिं लक्षणारूपां च वृत्तिं विनैवान्वयबोधाङ्गीकारेण पदभिन्नेषु पदार्थेषु वृत्त्यभावेन अन्वयस्याशाब्दत्वाङ्गीकारात् तथापि तन्मते वाक्यान्तर्गतपदावयवप्रकृतिप्रत्ययोः

स्वस्वार्थवाचकत्वमेवास्ति । अतस्तन्मते सर्वथा वाचकत्वाभावो नास्ति । न ह्येवं सत्यज्ञानादि-वाक्यान्तर्गतस्यं कस्यापि पदस्य वाचकत्वं त्वया स्वीकृतम्। किञ्च समासे अनेकपदार्थसंसर्गस्य यौगिके प्रकृतिप्रत्ययार्थसंसर्गस्य च अवाच्यत्वेऽपि पदार्थस्य प्रत्ययार्थस्य च वाच्यत्वमस्त्येव। तथा च सर्वथा अवाचकत्वं नास्ति तदन्तर्गतस्य पदादेर्वाचकत्वाङ्गीकारादिति सत्यादिवाक्यान्तर्गतपदार्थभूतस्य ब्रह्मणो वाच्यत्वमनिवार्यम्। यदि तु ब्रह्म न पदार्थरूपं अपि तु पदार्थसंसर्गरूपं तदा सखण्डं स्यात्। यदि तु अवाच्य निर्विशेषमित्यदौ पदद्वयादिकं न स्वार्थसंसर्गपरम्, किन्तु ब्रह्ममात्रलक्षकम्, तर्हि ब्रह्मस्वरूपमात्रपरत्वेन तदवाच्यत्वलक्ष्यत्वयोस्तात्पर्याभावेन अवाच्यलक्ष्यादिपदेन ब्रह्मणोऽवाच्यत्वादिकं न सिध्यति इति चतुर्थ आक्षेपः।

तत्समाधानम्—अवाच्यादिशब्दः लक्षणया ब्रह्मस्वरूपं बोधयतीति वदतामस्माकं मते यः कोऽपि शब्दः न ब्रह्मवाचक इत्येव पर्यवस्यति । तथा च अवाच्यत्वं कुतो न सिध्येदिति। अवाच्यत्वे तात्पर्याभावेऽपि आनुषङ्गिकतया प्राप्तस्य अवाच्यत्वस्य निवारकाभावात्। [43]

[५]

अथ पञ्चम आक्षेपः—ब्रह्मणः शब्दावाच्यत्वे न किमपि प्रमाणमस्ति । न च 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते' 'अशब्दमस्पर्श' मित्यादि श्रुतिस्तत्र प्रमाणमिति वाच्यम्। तादृश श्रुतेर्ब्रह्मात्यद्भुतामित्यर्थे तात्पर्यात्।

> 'न तदीदृगिति ज्ञेयं न च वाच्यं न तर्क्यते ।
> पश्यन्तोऽपि न पश्यन्ति मेरो रूपं विपश्चितः ॥'

इत्यादौ दर्शनात्। किञ्च 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह' इति मनोवृत्तिविषयत्वमपि ब्रह्मणि निषिध्यते। तत्तु न युक्तम् । भवन्मते ब्रह्मणः अन्तःकरणवृत्तिव्याप्यत्वाङ्गीकारात् । एवञ्च ब्रह्म साकल्येन अन्तःकरणवृत्तिविषयो न भवति इत्यर्थो वक्तव्यः। तथैव 'वाचो निवर्तन्त' इत्यस्यापि ब्रह्म साकल्येन वाग्वृत्तिविषयो न भवतीत्येवार्थः। न तु ब्रह्म सर्वात्मना शब्दावाच्यम् इति। किञ्च 'यतो वाच' इत्यादिश्रुतौ यतः आनन्दं, ब्रह्मण इत्यादि बहूनां पदानां ब्रह्मवाचकत्वरूपमुख्यार्थलाभाय 'निवर्तन्त' इत्येकमेव पदस्वार्थात् प्रच्याव्य 'साकल्येन प्रतिपादनान्निवर्तन्त' इत्यर्थपरं स्वीकार्यम्, बहुबाधस्यान्याय्यत्वात् 'त्यजेदेकं कुलस्यार्थे' इति न्यायात् इति चतुर्थ आक्षेपः।

तत्समाधानम्—

'मनसा सहे'त्यनेन मनोजन्यवृत्तिसामान्यविषयत्वं न निषिध्यते, अपि तु अशुद्धमनोजन्य-वृत्तिविषयत्वमेव निषिध्यते । एव 'यतो वाच' इत्यनेन न वाग्जन्यवृत्तिसामान्यविषयत्वस्य निषेधः,

अपि तु शक्त्या या वाग्वृत्तिस्तद्विषयत्वस्य निषेधः । तथा च लक्षणया या वाग्वृत्तिस्तद्विषयत्वे न विरोधः ।

यत्तु आनन्दाद्यनेकपदानाम् अमुख्यार्थत्वापेक्षया 'निवर्तन्त' इत्येकपदस्यामुख्यार्थत्वमेव युक्तमिति । तन्न । निर्धर्मके ब्रह्मणि प्रवृत्तिनिमित्ताभावेन कस्यापि पदस्य शक्त्यभावात् बहुत्वस्याप्रयोजकत्वात् । अत एव 'कस्मादुच्यते परं ब्रह्म'इत्यादिश्रुतेः 'परमात्मेति चाप्युक्तः' इत्यादिस्मृतेश्च लक्षणया तत्तच्छब्दबोध्यत्वमात्रेण तत्तच्छब्दवाच्यत्वाभिलापः न तु शक्यत्वाभिप्रायेणेति न ताभ्यां विरोधोऽपि । [44]

[६]

अथ षष्ठ आक्षेपः—

वेदान्ततात्पर्यविषयो ब्रह्म वाच्यं वस्तुत्वात् लक्ष्यत्वाच्च तीरवत् । परमार्थसदादिपदं कस्यचिद्वाचकं पदत्वात् घटपदवत् । सत्यज्ञानादिवाक्यं वाच्यार्थतात्पर्यवत्पदयुक्तं वाक्यत्वात् अग्निहोत्रादिवाक्यवत् इत्याद्यनुमानैः ब्रह्मणो वाच्यत्वसाधकैर्विरोधात् अवाच्यत्वं न संभवतीति ।

अत्रोच्यते । निर्धर्मके ब्रह्मणि वाच्यत्वरूपसाध्याभावेन प्रथमानुमाने बाधः । तथा सधर्मकत्वमुपाधिः । यत्र यत्र वाच्यत्वं तत्र सधर्मकत्वसत्त्वात् पक्षे ब्रह्मणि तदभावाच्च । द्वितीयानुमाने हेतुभूतं पदत्वं किं नाम ? यदि सुप्तिङन्तत्वं, तदा वाचकत्वरूपसाध्याभाववति समासे राजपुरुषादौ सुप्तिङन्तत्वरूपहेतुसत्त्वात् व्यभिचारः । यदि तु शक्तत्वं तदा साध्याविशेषः । तृतीयानुमाने विषं भुङ्क्ष्वेति वाक्ये व्यभिचारः । तस्य वाक्यस्य शत्रुगृहभोजनमनिष्टसाधनमित्यर्थे तात्पर्येण तद्घटकस्य कस्यापि पदस्य वाच्यार्थे तात्पर्यविरहात् । [45]

[७]

अथ सप्तम आक्षेपः —

ब्रह्मणः अवाच्यत्वे लक्ष्यत्वं नोपपद्यते । वाच्यार्थसंबन्धित्वेन ज्ञातस्यैव तीरादेर्लक्ष्यत्वदर्शनात् । ब्रह्मणः वाच्यार्थसंबन्धित्वेन ज्ञानं च न शब्दभिन्नेन, उपनिषन्मात्रगम्यत्वात् । नापि स्वप्रकाशतया, तथा सति शब्दवैयर्थ्यात् । अतः वैदिकपदमेव वाच्यार्थसंबन्धितया ब्रह्म बोधयतीति वक्तव्यम् । तत्र अवाच्ये ब्रह्मणि शक्त्यभावेन लक्षणयैव तथा बोधयतीति तत्रापि वाच्यसंबन्धित्वेन ज्ञानापेक्षया अनवस्था प्रसजतीति ।

तत्रेदं समाधानम्— यत्र शक्यार्थज्ञानपूर्वकं लक्ष्यार्थोपस्थितिस्तत्रैव वाच्यार्थसंबन्धित्वेन लक्ष्यार्थज्ञानापेक्षा । ब्रह्म तु स्वप्रकाशतया स्वत एवोपस्थितमिति न तत्र तथा ज्ञानस्यापेक्षा । न च स्वप्रकाशत्वे शब्दवैयर्थ्यमिति वाच्यम् । आवरणभूताज्ञाननिवर्तकवृत्तिज्ञानजनकतया शब्दसार्थक्यात् । [46]

[८]

सत्यादिशब्दानां न ब्रह्मलक्षकत्वं संभवति । लक्षकत्वे सिद्धे प्रवृत्तिनिमित्ताभावः, निमित्ताभावाद् वाचकत्वाभावे सिद्धे लक्षकत्वमित्यन्योन्याश्रयः चक्रक वा प्रसजतीति अष्टम आक्षेपः ।

तस्य समाधानम्—ब्रह्मणि निर्विशेषत्वप्रतिपादकेन श्रुतिवाक्येनैव निमित्तजात्याद्यभावस्य सिद्धत्वात् निमित्ताभावसिद्धौ लक्षकत्वसिद्धेरनपेक्षणात् ।[17]

[९]

नवमः आक्षेपः —

निर्विशेषादिवाक्यस्य किं ब्रह्मस्वरूपमात्रे तात्पर्यम् उत निर्विशेषत्वादिविशिष्टे । आद्ये विशेष्यपरविशिष्टपरवाक्ययोरविरुद्धत्वेन स्वरूपमात्रपरनिर्विशेषवाक्यस्य विशेषाभावरूपविशेषणे तात्पर्याभावेन सत्यत्वादिवैशिष्ट्यप्रतिपादकसत्यादिवाक्यबाधकत्वात् सत्यत्वादिधर्मोऽपि ब्रह्मणि सिध्येत् । द्वितीये विशेषाभावरूपनिमित्तस्य सत्त्वेन तं पुरस्कृत्य ब्रह्मणो निर्विशेषशब्दवाच्यत्वं स्यात् इति समाधानम् । विशेषाभावो हि ब्रह्मणि निर्विशेषशब्दप्रवृत्तौ निमित्तम् । तच्च विशेषसामान्यविरोधि । अर्थात् विशेषाभावरूपं तदतिरिक्तं भावरूप विशेषं च न सहते । अतः तादृशनिमित्तविरहात् ब्रह्मणो न वाच्यत्वमिति । किञ्च विशेषाभाववति ब्रह्मणि वाच्यत्वरूपो विशेषोऽपि कथं स्यात् । तस्मात् ब्रह्मणः अवाच्यत्वं सुस्थितम् ।[18] एतावता अद्वैतसिद्धयुक्तानि समाधानानि प्रतिपादितानि ।

वेदान्तपरिभाषाकाराश्च विशिष्टवाचकानां पदानां विशेष्यपरत्वेऽपि न लक्षणा, शक्त्युपस्थितविशिष्टयोरभेदान्वयानुपपत्तौ विशेष्ययोः शक्त्युपस्थितयोरेवान्वयसम्भवात् । तस्मात्तत्त्वमसीत्यादौ आचार्याणां लक्षणोक्तिरभ्युपगमवादेनेति अभिप्रयन्ति ।[19]

महामहोपाध्यायाः अनन्तकृष्णशास्त्रिणस्तु शतभूषण्यां प्राक्तनग्रन्थानारूढं नूतनं कञ्चन पक्षमुपक्षिपन्—

"यदा तु—

प्रत्यस्तमितभेदं यत् सत्तामात्रमगोचरम् ।
वचसामात्मसंवेद्यं तज्ज्ञानं ब्रह्मसंज्ञितम् ॥ [६·७·५३]

इति विष्णुपुराणवचनान्निर्विशेष एव ब्रह्मशब्दस्य सङ्केतेन मुख्यवृत्तत्वं गम्यते, तदा तु मुख्यवृत्तत्वे नैव साधुत्वम् । ....'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते' इत्यवाच्यवादस्तु ब्रह्मलक्ष्यतापक्षेण"[50] इति । एतत्तत्वं तु विदुषां परामर्शमर्हति ।

NOTES

1. *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, 6-8-7.
2. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, 1-4-10.
3. Cited in the *Advaita-siddhi* (*Nyāyāmṛtādvaitasiddhi*, ṣaḍdarśanaprakāśanasthānam, Varanasi, 1977) p. 832.
4. *Bhāmatī* (with *Kalpataru* and *Parimala*, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay; 1917) p.97.
5. *Taittiriyopaniṣad*, 2-9
6. *Ibid*.
7. *Ibid*, 2-4.
8. Śankara's *bhāṣya* on the *Taittirīyopaniṣad* (Published with the commentary *Vanamālā*, Chinmaya Foundation of Education and Culture, Madras, 1981), pp. 223-224.
9. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, 3-9-26.
10. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad bhāṣyavārttika*, 1-4-858.
11. *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, 2-1
12. p. 113
13. *Mahābhāṣya* with the commentaries *Pradīpa* and *Udyota* (Vol. I, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1917) p. 90.
14. *Ibid*.
15. *Taittirīyopaniṣadbhāṣyavārtikam*, with the commentary by Anadajñāna (Ānandasrama Sanskrit Series, Poona, 1911), *Brahmavalli*, 9-96.
16. *Ibid*, 9-100
17. *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* with the commentary *Candrikā* by Jñānottama (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1980), 3-103.
18. *Ibid*, 3-104.
19. *Ibid*, 3-105.
20. *Ibid*, 3-106.
21. *Ibid*, p. 168
22. *Iṣṭasiddhi* (Gaekwad Oriental Series, LXV, Baroda, 1933) p. 174.
23. *Pañcapādikavivaraṇam* with *Tātparyadīpikā* of Citsukha and *Bhavaprakāśikā* of Nṛsimhāśrama (Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Madrass, 1958) pp. 699-702.
24. *Ibid*, p.702.
25. *Ibid*.
26. *Ibid*.
27. *Ibid*. p. 703
28. *Saṁkṣepaśārirakam*, I, 939.
29. *Ibid*, I, 240.
30. *Padārthatattvanirnaya* of Ānandānubhava (Advaitasabha Series, No. 5. Kumbakonam 1951) p.43.

31. *Ibid*, p.44
32. *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* of *Ā*nandānubhava (Madras Government Oriental Series, No. CLX VI, 1961), pp. 146-147.
33. *Siddhānta-leśa-sangraha* with the commentary *Kṛṣṇālankāra* (Śrīmad-Appayya-Dīkṣitendra-Granthāvali-Prakāśapa-Samiti, Secunderabad, 1973) pp. 339-340.
34. *Ibid*, p.339.
35. *Nyāyāmṛtādvaitasiddhi* (Ṣaḍdarśanaprakāśanasthānam, Varanasi, 1977) Vol. II, p.999.
36. *Ibid*.
37. *Ibid*.
38. *Ibid*, p. 1000.
39. *Saṁkṣepaśārīraka*, 1-240.
40. *Ibid*, 1-241.
41. *Nyāyāmṛtādvaitasiddhi*, p.1000.
42. *Ibid*.
43. *Ibid*, pp. 1000-1002.
44. *Ibid*, pp. 1002-1003.
45. *Ibid*, p. 1003.
46. *Ibid*, pp. 1003-1004.
47. *Ibid*, pp. 1005-1006.
48. *Ibid*, p. 1006.
49. *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* (Sri Venkatesvar Steam Press, Bombay,) p. 241.
50. *Śatabhūṣaṇi* (Published in Madras, 1956), p. 53.

Haramohan MISHRA, Balasore, (Orissa)

THE CONCEPT OF INDESCRIBABILITY

Indescribability or *anirvacanīyatā* is a fundamental concept in *Advaita*. It is said to be the nature of the world or any thing different from *cit*, which is also a synonym of falsity (*mithyātva*). Discussing five definitions of falsity, given by the previous teachers of *Advaita*, Srī Madhusūdana Sarasvatī refers to the writer of *pañcapādikā* for the first definition, according to which the word 'false' means indescribable.[1] The concept of indescribability which is unique and irresistible as expounded by *Advaita* seems plausible, which paradoxically, is logical and beyond logical reasoning at the same time. It is logical as it is the outcome of logical reasoning regarding the ultimate nature of the world; it is also a-logical in so far as it eludes the fixed norms and standards of conventional reasoning. It is interesting to note that *avidyā*, which is itself indescribable and the cause of the world, which is also indescribable, is described as anttagonistic to all reasoning (*sarvanyāyavirodhinī*)[2]. It seems absurd, from the common man's point of view, to say that the well-defined things of the world like pot, cloth etc., which are directly perceived by our senses are false or indescribable. It also appears contradictory to describe the world as indescribable, as it ceases to be indescribable when it is described as indescribable. The most formidable objection to this doctrine of indescribability is to question the possibility of such a category in the actual world of experience. This paper seeks to examine the various possibilities and validity of such a concept with special reference to *Advaita*.

In the early days of comparative philosophy, when many scholars read into *Advaita Vedānta* similarities with some western philosophical systems, this indescribability was viewed in a psychological-metaphysical manner. It was thought that indescribability was due to the inherent incapability of human mind, which only perceives through its categories, to comprehend the things as they are.[3] Recently, there have been efforts to interpret indescribability from a purely logical or linguistic point of view. It is said that like truth and untruth, indescribability can only belong to judgements but not to the things of the world. According to this interpretation indescribability, which is due to bringing together into a relation the two incompatibles -*Viz*-the subject and the predicate, is the characteristic of logical judgements.[4] Both these contentions prove unsatisfactory when they are evaluated in the light of *Advaita*. It is to be borne in mind that according to *Advaita* indescribability is the very nature of the world, but it is due to neither the fault in the means of knowledge nor the fault which

causes mispredication in a judgement. Śrīharṣa clearly states that this indescribability or *anirvacanīyatā* is not due to the fault of the speaker (*vaktṛdoṣa*) but it is the very nature of the knowable (*meyasvabhāvānu-gāminī*).[5] Vācaspati in his *Bhāmatī* makes this position clear by saying that the water which is superimposed on the rays (mirage) is to be taken as indescribable, as it cannot be either real or unreal.[6] Thus, indescribability can neither mean agnosticism nor a linguistic error.

Now we may examine the possibilities of the this concept. It cannot be said that it is contradictory to describe some thing as indescribable. The fact is that here indescribable is not accepted as such in its ordinary meaning. It only means which cannot be described either as real or as unreal. In other words it means the absolute absence of both reality and unreality (*Sattvātyantābhāvatve sati asattvātyantābhāvarūpam*).[7] The dualists oppose this definition, as, according to them, the absence of any one of the pair reality and unreality necessarily implies the other. Indescribability, in view of the non-Advaitic systems, can only mean inability to describe. But there can be no fact in the world of experience which has the characteristic indescribability.

Though this is not possible within the framework of the non-Advaitic thoughts, the *Advaitins* reiterate, this is very much possible in the factual world, when viewed from the Advaitic stand point. To refute the charge of the dualists that absolute absence of both reality and unreality cannot be possible in one locus Madhusūdana formulates three possible relations between reality and unreality. Firstly, reality and unreality can be conceived in such a way that the absence of one implies the other or as mutual exclusives: secondly, each of them may be conceived as the *Vyāpaka* of the absence of the other; thirdly, each of them may be conceived as the *vyāpya* of the absence of the other. The third alternative *viz* each of them is the *vyāpya* of the absence of the other is accepted by the *Advaitins*. In view of this, the absolute absence (*atyantābhāva*) of both reality and unreality can be possible in one locus, as the absence of cowness and horseness can be possible in the camel.[8]

To understand the concept of indescribability we should keep in mind the definitions of reality and unreality, as given by the *Advaitins*. According to *Advaita*, reality (*sattva*) means unsublatability in three time (*trikālābādhyatva*) and unreality means incapability to appear as real in a perceived locus (*pratipannopādhi*). The only Real is the *Brahman*, as it defies all changes. Absolute non-entities like the son of a barren lady cannot appear as real in any perceived locus. The false objects are accepted as capable of appearing as real, but not the unreal, as, unlike the unreal, they have got superimpositional identity with the real (the *Brahman*), on which they are superimposed. The shell-silver or the serpent that appears in the rope cannot be real as it is sublated afterwards. It cannot be unreal as it appears as real. It cannot be both real and unreal as it is contradictory. So, the shell-silver can only be said to be different

from both real and unreal. It is to be noted that reality and unreality, being conceived in *Advaita* as the *vyāpya* of each other's absence, cannot co-exist in one locus, but their absence can very well be ascertained in one locus. As absence of both reality and unreality is indescribability or falsity the shell-silver is said to be indescribable or false. Indescribable includes both the apparent (*prātibhāsika*) like pot etc. and the *vyāvahārika* or empirical.[9] The apparent object is sublated by the right knowledge of the substratum *viz-* shell etc., The empirical is sublated by the right knowledge of the *Brahman*, as it is the substratum (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of it. So, citsukha defines indescribility as sublatability by knowledge.[10]

It is to be noted that indescribability is the necessary outcome of the way in which reality and unreality are defined in *Advaita Vedānta*. But it is not only a problem of language, as the *Advaita* logic is attested by the facts of experience. The non-*Advaitins* define reality and unreality in such a way that there can be no third alternative as indescribability. We must admit that the controversy is due to partly a linguistic difference, but the root of the difference lies in much depth, in their conception of reality, unreality and the value of life. For example, the Mādhvas define reality as the non-counterpositiveness (*apratiyogitā*) of the absence in all places and the three times. Both the superimposed and the *tuccha* or unreal are said to be the counterpositive of such absence.[11] It is to be noted that according to the Mādhvas the so-called false is also unreal (*asat*) as both the superimposed and the *tuccha* are put into one category in their philosophy. The Mādhvas, being the champions of difference and realism believe in the reality of the things of the world. Nothing in the world is unreal as it is not the counterpositive of the absence in all places and all times. Only the superimposed like shell-silver and the *tuccha* like hare's horn can be the counterpositive of such absence, so they are said to be unreal. What is interesting to note that the Mādhvas are satisfied with the reality of the things of the world, which they do not question at all. They do not have any conception nor do they have any necessity of a higher grade of reality. The dualists also illogically put both false and unreal in one category. Though both of them are the counterpositive of the aforesaid absence, the difference between them is the capability of appearing in identity with the Real (*Sattādātmya*) and non-appearing as such, which the dualists overlook unfortunately. Other definitions of real as capable of fruitful activity (*arthakriyāsamartho*) and related to the universal reality (*sattājātisaṁbaddha*) are fraught with fallacies. The functional definition falls short of truth as the erroneous object can some times produce fruitful activity also. The definition of the *Naiyāyikas* as related to the universal reality is also untenable. The *Nāyāyikas* cannot justify why the two cognitions 'The substance is real, and 'The universal is real' are expressed alike with no distinction of relation even though the universal reality is related with them directly and indirectly (*paramparayā*) respectively. The cognitive judgements do not vary even though the *saṁsargatā* is said to be different, which falsifies the position of *Nyāya*.[12]

From the above discussion it is clear that the concept of indescribability, as expounded by the *Advaitins*, is logical as well as supported by the word of facts. With the illustration of the apparent like shell-silver which cannot be anything but indescribable, the *Advaitins* prove the indescribability of the empirical world. The reason, adduced for the falsity of the world, is that it is seen (capable of being seen or *dṛśya*) like the shell-silver. The arguments, supporting this inference of falsity are the absurdity of the opponents' view, upholding the reality of the world, the causal - argument that renders the effect inexplicable apart from the cause and the epistemological argument that shows the unintelligibility of the relation between *dṛk* and *dṛśya*. The basic aim is to show that the world of experience can be nothing more than indescribable, which needs a separate paper to be dealt with.

However, it is only from the logical point of view that the world is said to be indescribable. Vidyāraṇya says that *māyā* is unreal, indescribable and real from the standpoints of the person, proficient in the *śruti*, the logician and the ordinary man respectively.[13] *Śrīharṣa* says that indescribability of the world is asserted in the way of the others.[14] Thus, indescribability is only a functional concept, which aims at making others understand the truth of *Advaita*, the *Brahman*, which is the only Reality.

NOTES

1. *Advaita Siddhi*, (Parimal Pub : 1982) p.48
2. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika*, vs.181
3. Paul Deussen, S. Radhakrishnan, A. C. Mukherji etc. Compare, *Advaita* with Kantian and Neo-Kantian Philosophies.
4. See Ganeswar Misra's *The Advaita Conception of Philossphy : Its method, scope and limits.*
   Also see Bijayananda Kar, *The theories of error in Indian Philosoph*, Ajanta Publication, Delhi : 1978
5. *Khaṇḍana-Khaṇḍa-Khādya* of *Śrī*harṣa, (Chowkhamba : Varanasi, 1970) p.69
6. *Bhāmati*,
   (Motilal Banarasidass : New Delhi, 1980) p. 13
7. *Advaita Siddhi*, P. 350

8. *ibid*, pp.50-55

9. *ibid*, p. 630

10. *Citsukhi*,
(Saddarsana Prakasan Pratisthan, 1974) p. 138

11. '*trikālasarvadeśiya nisedhā pratiyogitā śattocyate' dhyastatucche tam prati pratiyoginī'*
*Nyāyā*mṛta quoted in *Bālabodhinī*, See lst def. of falsity, ***Advaita siddhi***, Tara Pub., 1970

12. *Advaita siddhi*, p. 353-354

13. *Pañcadaśī*, 6.130

14. *KhaṇḍanaKhaṇḍa Khādyā, Op cit*, p. 71

———

Bijayananda Kar, Bhubaneswar

THE NYĀYA ACCOUNT OF NIRVIKALPAKA

Nyāya philosophy interpretes *jñāna* in a comprehensive sense. The terms: *buddhi* and *jñāna* are used synonymously by Gotama.[1] The same rendering has also been accepted by Śrīdhara in his *Nyāyakandalī*.[2] It comes to suggest that any sort of cognitive state is included within the scope of *jñāna* and *jñāna* does not necessarily refer to true judging of the state-of-affair. The definition that *jñāna* is the revelation of object[3] implies that it only stands for a conscious apprehension of the situation irrespective of the point whether the act of of judging is true or false. *Jñāna* has been classified either as presentative (*anubhava*) or as representative (*smṛti*) in so far as it is either original or reproduction of the previous judgement.[4] *Anubhava* as well as *smṛti* are either correct or incorrect. In the former case they are *yathārtha* (in accordance with the nature of object) and in the latter case they are *ayathārtha*. It may be noted here that *smṛti* has been classified into *yathārtha* and *ayathārtha*, yet in general it is taken as *apramā* (invalid) because it is only representational and not presentational judgement. There are some cases of presentational judgements which are not true (*ayathārthānubhava*) and those include false judgements (*viparyaya*), dubitable judgement (*saṁśaya*) and hypothetical judgement (*tarka*).[5] *Jñāna* which does not correctly reveal the object is not necessarily false. That is why under the category of *apramā*, both *tarka* and *saṁśaya* are included besides *viparyaya*.

All this shows that *jñāna*, in the Nyāya context, has not been used in its usual sense of conveying truth alone. It is wide enough to include all cases of judgements namely judging something as what it is (*yathārtha*), judging it as what it is not (*bhrama*) and also cases of judging the given as indefinite or provisional. While elucidating the characteristics of *jñāna*, the linguistic or conceptual element has been properly emphasised in Nyāya epistemological tradition. Annaṁbhaṭṭa emphasises, in this connection, on *vyavahāra*[6] and Govardhana, in his *Nyāya-Bodhinī*, interpretes *vyavahāra* as *śabda prayoga*. That clearly suggests that within Nyāya framework at least no *jñāna* is possible unless there is conceptualisation or use of language. That one actually speaks out the language is, however. not emphasised here. Only for the formation of *jñāna*, the epistemic requirement is insisted from logical point of view that there is the involvement of conceptual element. In other words *jñāna*, either it is presentational or representational, either correct or not-correct, is bound to be linguistic. This implies that *jñāna* is necessarily judgemental.

Now, if this is in general the account of *jnāna* in Nyāya epistemology (*jñāna-mīmāṁsā*, the next question crops up in this regard is to relate it with *nirvikalpaka*. Discussions have been raised already as to whether *nirvikalpaka* as distinguished from *savikalpaka*, is knowledge or not. And, in this connection, it has been remarked that even if *nirvikalpaka* is not an instance of knowledge, it is definitely an instance of *jnāna*.[7] This view is based on the ground that *jnāna*, being used in wider sense than knowledge, includes *nirvikalpaka* as well.

Before advancing any comment on this view, it seems proper to refer to the remarks made by Gotama. To him, perception is the non-erroneous judgement which is produced by the intercourse of the sense-organs with the object which is not associated with name and which is well-defined.[8] Here it can be marked that even though according to Gotama the object of *pratyakṣa* in itself is regarded to be not associated with any name, the knowledge (*pratyakṣa-jñāna*) is clearly said to be well-defied (*vyavasāyātmakam*). This reveals that perceptual knowledge is categorised (*savikalpaka*). Of course, being a logician, Gotama cannot avoid the possibility of a logically prior state which is presupposed in every instance of judgement. In order that one has a presentative judgement, one has to apply concepts upon the pure that, the given datum, which is inexpressible (*avyapadeśyam*). And that inexpressible given is the very basis of all judgements either correct or incorrect. But that which is inexpressible and is to be invested with concepts can, by no stretch of conceivability, be a piece of *j`āna*, what to say of being *pramā*. To put differently, *avyapadeśyam*, the pure given becomes the object of knowledge only when it is well-defined or conceptualised. This implies that *pratyakṣa jñāna* or any *jñāna* for that matter is necessarily judgemental; for that involves categorisation. If this is accepted then how can the so called *nirvikalpaka pratyakṣa* which is devoid of predication and conceptualisation can be regarded as *jñāna* ?

It is, however, the case that in certain circle *nirvikalpaka* is designated as *pratyokṣa*. But it should be noted that the status of non-conceptualised *pratyakṣa* is not clearly accepted as an independent form of *jñāna* in the Nyāya epistemological tradition. Gotama, Vātsāyana and even Uddyotakara do not refer to *nirvikalpaka jñāna*. It is Vācaspati who, perhaps for the first time, refers to the distinction between *nirvikalpaka* and *savikalpaka* in his *Tātparyaṭīkā* by way of interpreting the words : *avyapadeśyam* and *vyavasāyātmakam* contained in Nyāya-Sūtra. But, even there, *nirvikalpaka* has not been taken as an independent form of *jñāna*, rather it is only logically assumed as prior to *savikalpaka*.. *Nirvikalpaka* is only the ground of the *savikalpaka* knowledge of a thing.

It is because of this, the later celebrated Nyāya philosopher, Viśvanātha Pañcānana has clearly asserted that non-conceptualised state is not a matter of perception.[9] While analysing the nature of *jñāna* or concestualised judgement, the Nyāya

philosopher draws attention to two distinct logical points, namely, referent (*artha*) and description (*prakār*). The *artha* is the given datum. Unless the datum is presented, the concepts by themselves cannot formulate a judgement. Here the datum need not be construed as a perceptual datum. It has been only taken as a logical datum. The referent is never missed in any piece of *jñāna*. That is the reason why Uddyotakara remarks that the referent all the while remains what it actually is. There is the standing assumption that all judgements, whether true or not, are referential.[10] But mere referent without the application of *prakāra* canot yield *jñāna*. As it has already been made clear that *jñāna* in order to be *jñāna* must be conceptualised. In that sense there must be the application of *vikalpa* or category.

It seems therefore evident that *nirvikalpaka* does not mean another piece of *jñāna* either in the sense of non-conceptualised bare awareness or a piece of unverbalised cognition. It only points at the referent of the judgement (the pure *that*). The 'that' only when it is related with 'what' gives rise to the formulation of a judgement or *jñāna*. Referent is only logically prior to description. And in that way *nirvikalpaka* need not be viewed as psychologically a prior state. The referent, devoid of all attributions, is not within the discourse but is rather the formal assumption for all discourse. In other words *nirvikalpaka*, in Nyāya epistemology, serves nothing more than being a logical postulate. It is not *jñāna*, but the very presupposition, the ground upon which the conception of *jñāna* is formulated. This conclusion need not suggest that so far as Nyāya framework is concerned there is no distinction between *jñāna* and knowledge. In fact it has been indicated before that knowledge while refers to true judgement, *jñāna* is wider in scope. But *jñāna*, as far as Nyāya is concerned, is shown to have been clearly implying judgement and in that sense it is bound to be conceptual. As such it can never be *nirvikalpaka*.

NOTES

1. *Buddhirūpalabdhirjñānamityanarthāntaram—Nyāya-Sūtra*, 1.1.15.
2. *buddhirūpalabdhirjñānam pratyaya iti paryāyaḥ—Nyāyakandalī*.
3. *arthaprakāśo buddhiḥ—Tarka-kaumudī* of Laugākṣī Bhāskara.
4. *saṁskāramātrajanyam jñānam smṛtiḥ, tadbhinnam jñānānubhavaḥ—Tarka-saṁgraha* of Annaṁbhaṭṭa.
5. *ayathārthānubhavastrividhaḥ saṁśayaviparyaya tarkabhedāt—Tarka-saṁgraha.*
6. *sarvavyavahāraheturguno buddhijñānam—Tarka-saṁgraha.*

7. G. C. NAYAK: "Can there be any indeterminate perception?", ***Darshana International***, No. 2, Vol. X, April 1970. Subsequently also published in his book: ***Essays in Analytical Philosophy***. It maybe pointed out here that NAYAK's view is about the Indian epistemological approach in general and in which Nyāya of course finds a place.

8. *indriyārthasannikarṣotpannam jñānam avyapadeśyam avyabhicāri vyavasāyātmakam* —*Nyāya-Sūtra*, 1.1.4.

9. *nirvikalpakam na pratyakṣam...vaiśiṣṭyānavagāhi jñānasya pratyakṣam*—*Siddhānta Muktāvalī*. See also *Tattva-cintāmaṇi* of Gangeśa: "*nirvikalpakañca pramāpramābahirbhūtameva, vyavahārāṇāmagatvāt*—"*Pratyakṣa khaṇḍa* (Non-conceptualised, being beyond validity and invalidity, is rather practically or epistemologically useless).

10. For elaboration of this issue see my book: *The Theories of Error in Indian Philosophy*, Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1978, pp. 59-63.



P. Sriramamurti, Waltair

PHILOSOPHY AND AESTHETICS

A view of life and a world view, a *Darśana* includes in it an explanation of creation and appreciation of art. In our country the word for art is *kalā* which like the word *kāvya* meant seeing and showing, visualisation of Beauty and its expression in different forms. *Kalās* are sixty four or more inclusive of both the fine arts and useful arts. According to Vātsyāyana they formed necessary equipment of a *Nāgarika*. The earliest philosophers of India, the Vedic seers were poets and their art was compared to carpentry by them. They described the making of earth and heaven too as a kind of carving. Bharata was the first of our art critics and he conceived *Nāṭya* as a full art where poetry, music, dance and architecture found their place. It was also said to have universal appeal utilising all the *Vidyās*, *Śilpas*, and *Kalās*. *Nāṭya* and *Kāvya* with their wide scope formed the main centre for art theories. Bharata defined *Nāṭya* as—*avasthānukṛtiḥ*, an imitation, representation of human activity comprising *abhinaya* of the four types. It produced the aesthetic effect called *Rasa* through the depiction of characters and their emotive moods which process is enunciated in the famous formula—*vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisaṁyōgādrasaniṣpattiḥ*. When mere *Vastu* or *Alaṁkāra*, a fact or an idea is treated by an artist and made an artifact through suggestivity, it became an object of beauty. These ideas have been cardinal principles of art theories in India throughout. We shall now notice how certain patent philosophies of India approached this problems. *Mīmāṁsā*, *Nyāya*, *Sāṁkhya*, *Vedānta* and *Āgama* views of life explained art experience in their own ways. Abhinavagupta of Kashmir of 9th-10th centuries of Christian era was the foremost among them whose theories of art creation and art appreciation have stood the test of time to date. The conclusions reached by him are considered to be valid even to-day and they are considered to be even relatively novel to Western thought (Gnoli). We now notice here how a few of these philosophies are applied to the criticism of art.

According to the *Sāṁkhyas*, *Puruṣa* through the mediation of *buddhi* tries to realise the two ideals of life-*bhoga*, worldly enjoyment or *apavarga* i. e., *kaivalya*, spiritual aloofness through right knowledge. Everything that is outside in the world or the psychic in the mind are possessed of the three *guṇas-sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, one of them predominating. They lead to *sukha*, *duḥkha* and *moha* respectively. The *buddhi* associated with every *Puruṣa* has *vāsanās*, the acquired Karmic impulses. They modify its original *Sāttvic* character and make it more *rājasic* or *tāmasic*. We feel pleasure or

pain due to interaction of *buddhi* with external world, the *Puruṣa* remaining as an onlooker. Since *buddhi* intrinsically *sāttvic* is tarnished by *vāsanās* it has varied experiences. The mistaken identification of *puruṣa* with *buddhi* is the sole cause of his trouble. Ordinary man can not get detached and transcend *buddhi* and attain *kaivalya*. But while appreciating art he can temporarily get a release from the natural world. As pleasure without a trace of sorrow is not attainable in the real world he resorts to art for such a pleasure. In responding to art one attains equanimity and thereby temporary pleasure. Bhaṭṭanāyaka's theory of *Rasa* represents the *Sāṁkhya* approach. In art impersonalised forms are presented which are not related to the individual perceiver or any other. When the conventional meanings are presented by language, a process of impersonalisation sets in (*bhāvanā*) whereby the *Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas* etc., become generalised, (*Sādhāraṇīkṛta*). They gain a power of equal appeal to all getting dissociated with particular situations. These generalised ideas enable us to derive pure pleasure, *bhoga*—from the ideal creations of art· Thus artistic pleasure is more akin to wordly pleasures. The nature of this pure pleasure is a contemplative—or *Saṁvit* and a composed state—*Viśrānti*. It is thus characterised by *Sattvodreka*—an intensified *Sattvaguna*. Being a condition of pure pleasure it is unlike both the wordly and spiritual conditions—as the one is not always pleasurable and the other trancends pleasure and pain.

In *Vedānta* philosophy *Brahman* is described as *Ānanda*, Bliss. Bliss is revealed in our realisation of inner harmony, unification and synthesis of this universe. Normally we are absorbed in narrow distinction of self and their false identification (*adhyāsa*). One who attains perfect knowledge of the *Ātman*, the Real Self is *Jīvanmukta*. He realises the unity and enjoys *Ānanda*. On the empirical plane it is not possible to get that Bliss. But occassionally in transition to one state to another we have a glimpse into that unity characterised by Bliss, *e, g. suṣupti* or Artistic pleasure. A symmetry or a harmony of a beautiful object gives rise to such an enjoyment of Bliss. But according to *Vedānta*, true beauty lies within the self. All consiousness and bliss belongs to the self—which is of the nature of *Sat, Cit, Ānanda*. The outward beautiful form of the object is only a symbol, since we experience *Ānanda* at their sight. True beauty is thus revealed to the inner eyes. Our life comprises desire and activity arising out of ignorance—*avidyā* — *kāma* — *karma*. A seeker of truth strives for the total annihilation of *avidyā* and attains enlightenment. But a *Sahṛdaya* gets induced into him an attitude of detachment by means of ideal situations created by art. As product of imagination they do not cause desires in him. Other factors in art help in concentration and make him contemplate on it. They secure for him a kind of unification. While in *Mokṣa* one realises absolute unity with Truth, in art he realises temporary unity with artistic truth. He has thus a foretaste of *Mokṣa*, as it were. So art experience is called *Brahmānandasabrahmacāri*. The experience is conditioned—*Sopādhika* only. It forms a kind of intermediary *sādhanā*. But the *bhāvanā* or the mood of aesthetic contemplation evoked by suggestion is not a real function of the pure

inner self. It is a defect-*doṣa* as a result of which we have the imagined replicas of characters, a kind of an illusion — an *anirvacanīya*. The aesthetic experience as all empirical experience of pleasure is *Sākṣibhāṣya*, of the inner self, the spirit mistaking himself for the mind.

Abhinavagupta was a teacher of Kashmir Śaivism. The philosophy was a non-Vedic school based on *Śaiva Āgamas* known as *Trika*. The school accepts thirty six categories, *Tattvas*. The twenty five categories of *Sāṁkhya* and eleven more that are specific to *Trika* system. Śiva is 'I' the Universal Self with *Cit* or 'Being' as predominant. Śakti is 'I am' consciousness with *Ānanda*. The third one is *Sadāśiva* where will predominates and it is the *Brahman* of the *Vedānta*, *Parāvāk* of Grammar. *Īśvaratattva* is the predominant power of action. The individual self traverses the stages of consciousness in the reverse order and becomes one with *Śiva Tattva*. Then we have *Māyā* and *Kalā* and *Vidyā*, *Rāga*, *Kāla* and *Niyati* as effects of *Kalā*. In *Trika* philosophy creation is manifestation without of what is within the Universal Self through the four successive stages of universal consciousness of *Ānanda*, *Icchā*, *Jñāna* and *Kriyā*. *Mokṣa* is the realisation of the self as supreme consciousness—*Parāsaṁvit* which is like the post transcendental consciousness of the Yogins. It is attained finally by *Anūpāya* or *Ānandopāya* or *Pratyabhijñā* a kind of recognition where there is loss of distinct individual self—consciousness. It is *Anuttarā* state of highest reality. It is a kind of *Kramasamāveśa*—gradual immersion opposite of *Ābhāsa* manifestation of consciousness. This *parā* or *pūrṇā saṁvit*, supreme and complete consciousness is called *Camatkārasāra*. It is very much like the *Śuddha Brahman* of the Vedāntins. It is *Nirākṛti*—formless and *Viśvottīrṇa*—transcendental and also *Sarvākṛti* of manifold forms—and *Viśvamaya*—i. e. of the nature of *Prakāśa* and *Vimarśa* characterised by *jñāna* and *kriyā*. This corresponds to the *Turīya* and *Turīyātīta* states of individual consciousness.

In objective perception a mental image arises on account of contact of the sense with object. This mental image is conceived to be identical with the external object according to perceptual judgement (*dṛśyavikalpaikīkaraṇanyāya*).

Abhinava analysed the phenomena of art creation and art appreciation at the background of his philosophy. He centred his analysis around *Nāṭya* and *Kāvya*. The experiences of the characters, the poet and the critic are considered to be all alike. Especially the creative moment and the moment of aesthetic delight are more akin. A poet is a *ṛṣi*, a seer skilled in delineation, *varṇanānipuṇa*—a seer and a sayer at once. *Rasa* or aesthetic experience first belongs to the poet. It is his generalised consciousness: *kavigatasādhāraṇībhutasamvinmūlaśca kāvyapurassaro naṭavyāpāraḥ-saiva ca saṁvit paramārthato rasaḥ*. ABh. I, P. 295.

In the fullness of this experience the poet (vomits) gives out *Rasa* in poetry or *Rasa* overflows into poetry (art). *yāvat pūrṇo na caitena, tāvannaiva*

vamatyamum. Thus artistic creation is the direct, unconventional expression of a feeling generalised by an inner force within the artist, called *pratibhā*. It is devoid of limitations of time and space and personal interests. This state of consciousness that assumes the form of the poem (artifact) is transferred finally to *Sahṛdaya*, who is having the capacity to identify himself with the feelings of the poet (*sahṛdayatvam ca kavihṛdayatādātmyāpatti yogyatā*).

Thus *Sahṛdaya* recreates the aesthetic experience. This is termed as *Rasa Camatkāra*. It is a kind of direct perception (*Pratyakṣakalpa*), and it is non-discussive in character (*Nirvikalpa*).

Pratibhā is a kind of *prajñā*—consciousness responsible for newer creations and manifestations. *Pratibhā apūrvavastunirmāṇakṣamā prajñā*. It is an activity of the Self. While the poet is absorbed in the labour and search for that precise poetical creation, it comes as a direct flash, unexpectedly. It is likened to the third eye of Śiva. And *Camatkārarasa* when experienced by *Sahṛdaya* is also an activity. It is immersion in tasting or enjoyment of something that is aesthetic or mystic. Lack of this is inertness. *Sahṛdayatā* is a state of immersion in *camatkāra* (*adhikacamatkārāveśa eva sahṛdayatā*). It is a kind of *manaḥkarṇa* or *sphurattā* or *spanda*. *Camatkāritā* is *bhuñjanarūpatā svātmaviśrāntilakṣaṇā sarvatrecchā ...abhilāṣāmalā yatra bhāvāntaram sāmānyākāramapi vāsanāvaśeṣamātramāste i. e., akarmakam abhilāṣamātram......*The state of consciousness resting there with the *vāsan*'s being potential without reference to their objects.

The function of art by which this aesthetic pleasure is effected by art is called suggestion *vyañjanā* or *abhivyakti*. He followed Ānandavardhana in this, and therefore, he interprets the *Rasasūtra* to mean that *Rasa* is suggested or revealed by a combination of *vibhāvas etc.*, neither for mere expression of them nor a mention of the name of *Rasa* can arouse such a consciousness. *Rasa* realisation is thus a consequence of contemplation of dramatic or poetic presentation *carvaṇā* or *bhāvanā*.

We may now notice a few of the modern view points of the West—One American and one Europeon view points. George SANTAYANA was an American philosopher, critic of recent times: He was a naturalist philosopher and a gifted man of letters. For him philosophy terminates in poetic insight and poetry of practised and passionate imagination on the order of all things in philosophy. To SANTAYANA morality consists in a candid acceptance of the conditions of existence as action and the circumstances of life reveal. He advocated a kind of contemplative detachment. Man by means of his reflective spirit and a life of understanding recognises certain excellences. He estimates the human enterprises in terms of the extent to which they are realisations of the natural goods suggested by his imagination, itself a product of nature. He observes the phases of human progress in society, art, religion and science to life—a

rational life. Rational life is a life lived as a harmonious realisation of ideals, that are themselves reflective modifications of the impulses of an animal born into this world. He insists on being sensitive to all the goods which life in its various manifestations has, goods which life in its various manifestations has evolved and sustained. His criterion is "a variegated omnipresent human happiness". He set forth to an interpretation of the achievements and failures of human action in all departments of life very sympathetically. Ideal society is a companionship in mind of the spiritual objects and interests. Science is an imaginative hypothesis and Religion a myth. The impulse speaks in arts and makes the world an echo of its intent. Religion should cease to represent or mis-represent material conditions and embody only spiritual goods. Mythology is unconscious poetry and misleading science. It is poetically true. According to SANTAYANA a principle of goodness, a standard of excellance, or a canon of ideality has been the highest insight of all religions. It is the ideal of our true happiness that the spiritual man worshipped in religion. Thus it is with religion as it enters the life of reason that SANTAYANA is concerned. Spirituality is liberty in insight. There is ecstacy in selfless intuition of pure being.

Art is 'action which transcending the body makes the world a more congenial stimulus to the Soul'. Pleasure objectified is beauty and its experience.' Art is the best instrument of happiness. According to SANTAYANA aesthetic function cannot be divorced from the practical and the moral. Liberal arts bring a kind of spiritual meaning and fruition to material objects prepared by nature or industry. He distinguishes the arts of expression and arts of manipulation of things. A morality organised about the human heart would involve every fine art and would render the world pervasively beautiful. Art is the best instrument of happiness. Competence and freedom are combined in creativeness of art. If this influences all the enterprises of men it becomes the principle of their morality. Thus art and taste have a moral context. Beauty is the clearest manifestation of perfection, that is ultimate justification of being. It is a pledge of the possible conformity between soul and nature and a ground of faith in the supremacy of the good.

Jean Paul SARTRE was a French philosopher novelist of very recent times. His philosophy was a natural growth of European traditions of thought. It was a sort of existentialism and phenomenology. An analysis of consciousness is the central point of his philosophy. SARTRE pictures consciousness in two contrasts. There is a contrast between the moment-to-moment "being" of the consciousness concerning objects and itself and the inert "in themselves" of things. The second contrast is between the flickery discontinuous instability of consciousness, the moods and lack of concentration and a condition of perfect stability and completion towards which it aspires. The supreme value towards which consciousness is naturally and constantly transcending itself is the absolute being of self—a condition of being God. It is not a possible human condition. It is a state cf complete lucidity and complete changelessness. The reflective

consciousness that reveals to us this lack is moral consciousness. Man should transcend his human condition to attain a condition of conscious completeness or a condition of God. The work of art is an appeal or demand to the reader or spectator to recover this world by giving it to be seen as it is, but as if it had its source in human freedom. The reader has to recreate the poem. Our sense of the imaginative activity involved in recreating the work of art gives delight to us. It is a task set to freedom. We get in appreciation, a Godlike power of intellectual intuition. Aesthetic enjoyment is an active reflective awareness, presenting an autonomous totality of experience achieving a repose of a perfect equilibrium. To SARTRE beauty is a value of the imaginary world. The work of art is implicitly a self-portrait and the structure of the work of art embodies what the artist is conscious of. All intentional activity of any consciousness is constructive. Any agent is an artist and the facts of his situation are artifacts. Thus a reader or a spectator is in his turn an artist since his look is a vehicle of the constructive activity of his consciousness. The poet realises in each word a metaphor. Poetic language emerges on the ruins of prose for him. Thus the failure of communication becomes a suggestion of the incommunicable. Similarly the real is never beautiful. When confronted with certain events and real objects and adopt an aesthetic attitude, we withdraw ourselves in relation to the object contemplated and object itself slides into nothingness. The object becomes an analogue of itself, an image. It is only in the realistic level we have a sense of having. At the aesthetic level desire for possession disappears. The aesthetic enjoyment is experienced for its own sake.

We have by now surveyed the interpretations of artistic creation and art appreciation of the ancient Indian Philosophers and two modern Western Philosophers. The *Sāṁkhya* view considered art as a unique worldly experience devoid of its disadvantages due to its pre-eminently *Sāttvic* effect. The concept of *Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* 'universalisation' of Bhaṭṭanāyaka is generally acclaimed as a great contribution to philosophy of art. The *Advaita Vedānta* view of aesthetic enjoyment as a projection of Self that is Blissful in nature is also very significant. Art experience according to Abhinavagupta is an activity in enjoyment of the beauty of art in contemplation and art is a product of the manifestation of the power of the Self, *Pratibhā*. The concept of *Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* is given its deserving place. The symbolic and suggestive nature of artifact is also fully explained. These are the ideas that are almost universally accepted. We come to SANTAYANA the naturalist who applies reason to our diverse experiences in life. Art provides for a detached look and in transcending the world in art one finds beauty and pleasure in it. The impluse that is the source of artistic creation is *pratibhā*. Art renders the world look beautiful, moral. He advocates for an artistic approach in all our enterprises. Man is in flux and the fleeting nature inherent in him looks for an ideal stability. So he wants to transcend himself to find perfection. Art provides the look at the actuality of the world and prompts him to get freed from it. Man gets into his own world of autonomy in repose. The activity of the artist and the art critic are alike. His explanation of the function of art as suggestivity is also important. Thus

we find echoes of the same spirit in the East or in the West, in ancient or modern times.

"samvādāstu bhavantyeva bāhulyena sumedhasām"

Great minds think almost alike and arrive at the Truth and the differences in their view are only the various ways of arriving at it naturally determined by the difference in space and time.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* with *Abhinavabhārati* of Abhinavagupta, Gaekward Oriental Series.
2. Edman, Irwin, *The philosophy of Santayana*, (New and Greatly Enlarged Edn.) London Constable & Co., Ltd., 1953.
3. Gnoli, Raniero, *The Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta*, Rome, 1956 ; Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, Varanasi, 1963.
4. Hiriyanā, M., *Art Experience*, Kaivalya Publishers, Mysore, 1954.
5. Jagannātha's *Rasagangādhara*, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 1964.
6. (Ed.) Krishnamoorthy, K., *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana, Karnatak University, Dharwar, 1974.
7. Krishnamoorthy, K., *Studies in Indian Aesthetics and Criticism*, Mysore, 1979.
8. London, Robert, *The Philosophy of Jean Paul Sartre*, Methuen & Co., London, 1968.
9. Mohan, G. B., *The Response to Poetry, A study of Comparative Aesthetics*, People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 1968.
10. Murdoch, Iris, *Sartre, Romantic Rationalist* : *Essays in Aesthetics*, Newyork, 1963.
11. Pandey, Kantichandra, *Abhinavagupta, An Historical and Philosophical Study*, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1935.
12. Pandey, K. C., *Comparative Aesthetics*, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1956.
13. Santayana, George, *The Sense of Beauty* : *Essays and Literary Criticism*, Charles Scribners Sons, Newyork, 1956.

N. B. This paper was read in the Seminar on the Evaluation of Indian Philosophy in the context of world Philosophy by I. C. P. R. in Andhra University, Waltair.

K. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Dharwad

JAGANNĀTHA PAṆḌITARĀJA & HIS EULOGY OF MUSLIM PATRONS

I

The patronage of Muslim Mughal rulers to Sanskrit poets which began in the reign of Akbar became a regular and remarkable feature of rulers like Jehangir and princes like Dara Shikoh, who succeeced him. The one memorable poet laureate of the Delhi Durbar in early seventeenth century was Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja, the last of the great line of Sanskrit poet-critics, with significant originality in an era when decadence was reigning supreme in the world of letters. If Paṇḍitarāja's brilliance as a critic is evidenced in his trenchant polemics with doughty champions like Ruyyaka and Appayya Dīkṣita in his *magnum opus*, *viz.*, the *Rasagaṁgādhara*, his masterly felicity of expression, delicacy of thought brimming with varied sentiments and spontaneous or unlaboured figures of speech as well as thought, directed now to an outpouring of deep devotional fervour in *laharīs*, now to a euphemistic or allegorical raillery of social evils in *anyoktis*, now to a glorification of feminine charm or spiritual tranquillity in *śatakas*, have earned for him a lasting and outstanding place as one of the greatest later-day poets in Sanskrit. More than all, what deserves special notice is his unstinted admiration of the Muslim patronage which he enjoyed in contrast to the prejudiced strain of the usual run of Sanskrit poets. It is proposed in this paper to highlight this rather neglected aspect of Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja's eulogistic poetry (*praśasti-kāvya*).

II

The earlier attitude of the average Hindu poet's prejudice against the Muslim ruler is instanced in two anonymous verses we come across in Viśvanātha's *Sāhityadarpaṇa*. The first relates to Allauddin Khilji, the Sultan of Delhi :

सन्धौ सर्वस्वहरणम्
विग्रहे प्राणनिग्रहः ।
अल्लाउद्दीन नृपतौ
न सन्धिर्न च विग्रहः ॥

(NSP. Edn., 1922, p. 24)

"If one resorts to peace with him, Allauddin confiscates the entire property. If one takes to war, he takes away one's life. Thus with Sultan Allauddin there is no scope either for peace or war." Viśvanātha comments that the suggested idea here, *viz.*, one should win him over only by gifts or diplomacy is above the ken of even intelligent critics.

The other verse about a Sultan cited by him in the same work as an illustration of hyperbole (*utprekṣā*) is however eulogistic, though not without a touch of euphemistic denigration. :

गङ्गाम्भसि सुरत्राण तव निःशाननिस्वनः ।
स्नातीवारिवधूवर्ग—गर्भपातनपातकी ॥

(*op. cit.* p. 540).

"O Sultan, the bugle that resounds during your army's march is bathing as it were in the holy waters of the Gaṁgā, in order to cleanse itself from the sin of causing abortion to the pregnant queens of your enemy !"

III

Against this background of reservation on the part of Sanskrit poets, the full-throated admiration of Jagannātha now of the Delhi emperor Shahjahan or his kinsman Asaf Khan stands out pre-eminently. Among stray verses, the most oft-quoted one is, of course, :

दिल्लीश्वरो वा जगदीश्वरो वा मनोरथान् पूरयितुं समर्थः ।
अन्यैर्नृपालैः परिदीयमानं शाकाय वा स्याल्लवणाय वा स्यात् ॥

(Ed. A. SARMA, *Paṇḍitarājakāvyasaṁgrahaḥ*, Hyderabad, 1958, p. 190)

"My desire can be fulfilled either by the Lord of Delhi or by the Lord of the universe. What other kings might give would be barely enough to buy my vegetables or salt !"

In his mature poetry too he is of reminiscence over his happy days of youth spent under the loving care of his Delhi Emperor :

दिल्लीवल्लभपाणिपल्लवतले नीतं नवीनं वयः ।

(*op. cit.* p. 78)

He is as proud of his youthful stay in the Mughal court as his years dedicated to the devotional service of Hari at Mathurā in his last days. But the following verses are not so well known. They are at once hearty and highly poetic :

सुराणामारामादिह झगिति झंझानिलहृताः
पतेयुः शाखीन्द्राः, यदि तदखिलो नन्दति जनः ।
किमेभिर्वा कार्यम् ? शिव शिव विवेकेन विकलैः
चिरं जीवन्नास्तामधिधरणि दिल्लीनरपतिः ॥

(*op. cit.* p. 106)

"By a sudden stroke of good luck, were there to be a wild storm blowing down the celestial wish-yielding trees from Indra's park in Paradise to our earth, surely, one and all would be happy ! No, no, away with such foolish fancies ! O God, it is enough if the Delhi Emperor is reigning. May he live long !"

The feeling in this verse indeed rings with a genuineness in spite of its conventional format.

It can take a more artificial form sometimes by the upsurge of conventional conceits :

स्रष्टः सृष्टिकृता पुरा किल परित्रातुं जगन्मण्डलं
त्वं चण्डातप निर्दयं दहसि यज्ज्वालाजटालैः करैः ।
संरम्भारुणलोचनो रणभुवि प्रस्थातुकामोऽधुना
जानीमो भवता न हन्त विदितो दिल्लीधरावल्लभः ॥

(*Rasagaṁgādhara*, N. S. Edn., 1930, p. 405).

The idea is deliberately twisted and made to take a devious turn to serve as an instance of *aprastutapraśaṁsā*. Overtly, it is an address to the Sun-God.

"O Sun, you were created by Brahmā in order that you might protect the universe. But you have become too hot and you have started burning the same universe with your rays emitting flames of fire. The Emperor of Delhi is now leaving for the battlefield with eyes reddened by anger. We can only conclude that you are ignorant of the news !"

As explained by Jagannātha himself, even the Sun should get frightened by the news. Why should he be ? Because, the sun's orb is in danger of being smashed by the speeding departed spirit of the enemy fallen in battle when slain by the Delhi emperor. It is well known in the *smṛtis* that such brave war martyrs will straight reach the Sun's orb, never to return to *saṁsāra* again. The poet imagines this landing to involve a head-on collission, which even the Sun-god should dread ! This is indeed a very roundabout eulogy of the Mughal Emperor's prowess in battle.

A verse in the same strain is the apparent address to the ocean :

माहात्म्यस्य परोऽवधिर्निजगृहं गम्भीरतायाः पिता
रत्नानामहमेक एव भुवने को वापरो मादृशः ।
इत्येवं परिचिन्त्य मा स्म सहसा गर्वान्धकारं गमो
दुग्धाब्धे भवता समो विजयते दिल्लीधरावल्लभः ॥

(*Rasagaṁgādhara*, p. 496)

Its conventional banality is illustrated by the fact that the last word in the verse has the variant श्री प्राणनारायण: . It can serve as a readymade eulogy to any ruler, Hindu or Muslim, depending on the author's whim.

The mythical ocean of milk is asked to shed its pride as being unique in glory, majesty, possession of rare gems and so on. For, there is the emperor of Delhi more than a match to it in all these aspects. This is an instance of the figure of speech, *pratīpa*, where in the *upamāna* comes to be described as inferior to the *upameya*.

IV

I have reserved to the last a reference to Jagannātha's unique composition *Āsafavilāsa*, because it is short in compass (covering just two pages in print) and it is written in ornate prose with four verses interspersed. Asaf Khan who died in 1641 was the brother-in-law of Emperor Shahjahan. However, the first half of this eulogy is in praise of Shahjahan only and his tour with the army to the enchanting Kashmir valley set against the imposing and sublime backdrop of the Himālayas. In the royal entourage is the poet's patron, Asaf Khan, who takes a stroll in the lovely royal park in the company of charming damsels. Jagannātha says that he was a very generous patron of poets and artists; and calls his short composition *ākhyāyikā* or chronicle. I shall content myself here with a single example of Jagannātha's chiselled and eloquent prose eulogising Asaf Khan :

सार्वभौमसंबन्धिषु सकलेषु सामन्तेषु वाङ्मयेष्विव काव्यकलापः,
काव्यकलापेष्विव ध्वनिः, ध्वनिष्विव रसो, रसेष्विव
शृङ्गारः, सकलसहृदय हृदयंगमेन महिम्ना मधुरिम्णा च
सम्भावितः सकलशास्त्रसारावगाही नवावासफजाही । *op. cit.* p. 84

The place of Asaf Khan among all the kinsmen of Shahjahan is likened to that of poetry among literary genres, of *dhvani* or the poem with the resonance of suggestion among all poetic types, of *rasa* among *dhvanis* of the sentiment of love among all *rasas*, in point of greatness, and sweet universal appeal. He is also described as skilled in all learned lores.

Our brief review is enough to show thrt Jagannātha's gratitude to his Muslim patrons is both deep and eloquent. To appreciate his genuine feeling one may or may not give credence to the anecdote of his taking a Muslim damsel as his wife.

P. G. LALYE, Hyderabad

PERSONALITY OF IBRAHIM ALI SHAH AS REFLECTED IN NAVARASAMAÑJARI

I have published an unpublished manuscript of a book called the *Navarasamañjari*. As far as I know, I could procure the only copy available in India. The book is a work on *'Alaṁkāra Śāstra,'* written in about five hundred verses. This book is divided into six *Ullāsas* or chapters.

In the first chapter, the author Narahari praises his preceptor (Jagadguru) in about 172 stanzes. In the second one, he has given description of various types of Hero (*Nāyaka*). In the third *Ullāsa*, he gives an elaborate account of various types of Heroine (*Nāyikā*). In the fourth one, he gives the detailed descriptions of Heroine (*Nāyikāsvarūpa*). In the fifth *Ullāsa*, he has discussed *Rasa*, its origin etc. In the last *Ullā*sa (in the sixtyone) the author has given an account of various works.

A brief account of the work is given below :—

The author has paid glowing tributes to his preceptor. He calls his preceptor Jagadguru, Nādamūrti and Ibharāma. It appears that this Nādamūrti was a resident of Bijapur, Ibharāma or Ibrahim, must be Ibrahim Ali Adil Shah II, who ruled over Bijapur. Historians mention that he ruled over Bijapur during the period 1580-1627. In his reign the city of Bijapur was invested for twelve months (1580-81) by the united armies of the confederate sultans of Ahmednagar, Berar and Golconda. Bijapur, however, was saved by the diplomatic manoeuvers of Shah Abdul Hasan. Ibrahim began to rule in 1590, when he reintroduced the Sunni practices. But he was tolerant to all creeds. The King-dom in 1605 extended along the west Coast from Bankot to Bhatkal.

In 1602, Ibrahim built a new capital, *'Navarasapura,'* which is mentioned by Narahari in the present work. Though he did not actually shift the capital, he spent most of the time in the newly built lofty palace of *Navarasapura*. In 1627, at the time of his death, Bijapur had attained great power in territorial expansion. Ibrahim was a remarkable man with a versatile genius. He took interest in every branch of fine arts. He was a liberal patron of learning and scholars of almost all branches adored his court.

As Narahari has pointed out, he was a great Savant of Music. He composed the remarkable '*Kitab-i-Navaras*', which is a collection of songs in *Dakkhini* dialect. Narahari, probably might have been the court poet. Unfortunately, we do not get any information about Narahari. Even the manuscript, under consideration, is not referred to by any body. (The manuscript is borrowed from the Bharat Gunavardhaka Samstha Library, Hyderabad).

The Guru, belonged to *Gaṇapatigotra*. He has alluded himself the son of Sāradāvarya. As the preceptor belonged to Bijapur, it may not be wrong to suppose that Narahari also belonged to the same place. The following verses give the details :-

सकलगुणिकदम्बालम्बनं कण्ठपीठे
स्फटिकरुचिरमालो योऽस्ति विद्यापुरेशः ।
गुरुगणपतिगोत्रः शारदावर्यपुत्रः
स जयति यिभरामो मत्तमातङ्गगामी ॥ I-39

The author has alluded to the attacks of Delhi Kings on Bijapur :

आयुष्मान् भव पुत्रवांश्चककुभामास्थानि सत्कीर्तित—
सौभाग्यैकगृहीकृतानि भुवनत्राणैकदीक्षाक्षमः ।
स्पृष्टस्त्वं भवतायतो भगवता दिल्लीशदावानल—
ज्वालाग्रस्तमिदं सुधारसंदृशाद्राग्रक्षितं क्ष्मातलम् ॥ I-22

He has also described his preceptor as दक्षिणमध्यमण्डलमणि . It is said that Ibharāma built a city called *Navarasa* (I-63) which is described by Narahari in beautiful stanzas. Narahari has described the fame of his teacher. Here is an example .

क्षीराम्बुराशौ सितलक्ष्मलक्ष्मी—
रापाद्य सद्यः प्रससर्प द्रष्टुम् ।
ततोगुरोः कीर्तिसितं जगत्तद्—
विलोक्य पद्मा भ्रमते भ्रमेण ॥ I-71

There is a description of the palace of Ibharāma in about ten stanzas. At one place he has referred to a type of Jewel called *Bilanda*. One verse is enough to throw light on his power of fancy (*cf*. I-85).

विलन्दरत्नाङ्कुरितैर्मयुखैर्
नीराजनं कर्तुमितोद्यतोऽयम् ।
जगद्गुरो त्वामुदयायनित्यं
सत्यं हि मान्ये रविरुत्तमश्रीः ॥ I-85

After describing the fame of Nādamūrti Narahari has described the house, the elephant, the sword, the battle, the bow and the arrow, of Ibharāma. On going through all these descriptions, we can say that all these are original examples given by the author and they are all fine examples of good poetry. While describing the greatness of Nādamūrti, the following verse is given by the author ;—

त्वत्सैन्यवाहनिवहैः समरे समुत्थो
रेणुः प्रभाकरनिरोधनिदानमास्ते ।
त्वद्वैरिवामनयनानयनाम्बुसेकैः
सूर्याथिता अतिरुषा राममानयन्ति ॥ I-101

or

सङ्ग्रामदारित महारिपुसुन्दरीणां नेत्राऽञ्जनं कवलयन्नसिरेज उग्रः ।
पानं सपत्नयशसां रभसा वितन्वन् नाच्छादनं पुनरुपैति विवृद्धतृष्णः ॥ I-121

In Verse I-140 the author has referred to the nine sentiments spoken of by Bharata. In V-152, he refers to a King by name Rasūla. In verses 153-156, Narahari relates a story. He tells that once all the creatures of the world approached Brahmā, the creator, to relieve them of the increasing weight of the earth. He promised to do so, by taking birth as Nādamūrti. In the following verse, synonyms of Nādamūrti are given :—

नादमूर्तिःज्ञानमूर्तिःसत्यमूर्तिर्महायशाः ।
जगद्गुरुर्ज्ञानगुरुर्वाग्मी नवरसप्रियः ॥ I-163

There is a description about the state of enlightenment that was attained during the reign of Ibharāma. There were several learned scholars, in *Navarasapuri*, who were treated like his own disciples by Ibharāma (I-52). The subjects of Ibharāma seemed to have led a life of contentment, living in abundance of happiness (I-54, 55).

According to Narahari, the mansion of Ibharāma was a place where learned scholars found the bliss desired by the study of Philosophy and other sciences. It was accordingly called *Ānandamandiram* (I-88). Ibharāma was a fountain-head of Bliss for the learned and wise. Narahari has used the following two names for his masters' mansions—*Ānandamandiram* and *Saṁgītamandiram* (I-91).

Ibharāma had a majestic horse which is described as *Guṇamūrti* (I-91). Narahari describes the stately horse having an agile and delicate body. Its *gait* was swift and had very light ears (I-93).

Narahari speaks with great respect about Ibharāma's unbounded generosity as well as his benevolent attitude towards the imparting of education which had found its real meaning in his disciples. It is said that Ibharāma assured the complete success of his disciples.

Ibharāma seems to have been a very handsome person as described in the words प्रणयिनीनेत्रोत्सवः, सद्गुरुः . The author has paid rich tributes to his master's physical beauty. The following verse speaks eloquently of his extraordinary handsomeness (I-50).

There is a reference to the attacks of Delhi Kings, Ibharāma had put up a righteous defence against them (धर्मसेतोर्निबन्धनात् I-21). It was for this reason that he was highly praised by one and all.

Narahari substantiates the epithet 'Nādamūrti' or the personification of sound. Many stanzas throw light on Ibharāma's mastery over music.

The author has mentioned that the rampart of the 'City of knowledge' (also called *Bidiyāpura* in Persian works) dispelled the poverty of the scholars (I-62). Narahari has described the origin of various *Rasas* from this Nādamūrti, in verses 139 to 151. In a beautiful description, the poet has described the virtues of Ibhar ma, giving rise to various *Rasas*, including *Śama*. For example, the poet has maintained that he was the veritable 'Rudra' in smashing down the enemies. This Dreadful Rudra created the Dreadful sentiment :—

अयं नो तिग्मांशुः स चरति रथेनैव गगने
हुतो नो सप्तार्चिर्न स दशसु दिक्षु प्रसरति ।
अयं रुद्रः साक्षात्समरभुवि वैरीन्द्रदलनस्
तदाऽभूद् रौद्रोऽय रस इति जगुस्ते प्रतिभटः ॥ I-146

The virtues of Ibharāma described in *'Navarasamañjari'* are corroborated by the historical documents in Persian and Marathi. Ibrahim Adil Shah II, was a generous ruler as he wanted to maintain the *Bijapuri* culture as Deccan Culture in fact. So he tried to save many feudals from the onslaught of the Mughals.

From the history of Bijapur, gleaned from various sources, we come to know that at the time of accession to the throne, Ibrahim was nine years old. Ibrahim's aunt Chand Bibi, the dowager queen wielded full control over political matters. It was a period of regencies, which was characterised by the struggle for supremacy at the Court: When Ibrahim began to rule in 1590, Ibrahim reintroduced the *Sunni* practices instead of *Shia* doctrines, preached under the rule of the segents. He maintained harmony between various factions of his nobles.

Ibrahim extended his empire upto Malabar. The Nāyaka rulers of Karnataka and Mysore were forced to pay tributes. He had married the sister of Qutb Shah. When the Mughals laid siege at Ahmednagar, Ibrahim Adil Shah II came to the rescue of the sister kingdoms. In 1597, the Bijapur army clashed with that of Mughals for the first time. It is told that in 1627, his kingdom was flourshing with a rich treasury and 80,000 cavalry and 2 lakhs of infantry. He is described as a friend of many other principalities. He was the saviour of many feudals from the onslaught of the Mughals. During the Mughal campaign Ahmednagar in 1595-96, Ibrahim Adil Shah II deputed Rafiuddin Shirazi to Ahmednagar to resolve the disputes among the claimants of Nizam Shahi throne and ward off Mughal aggression. In 1607, he prevented Malik Amber from deposing Murtada Nizam Shah. In 1616 he was instrumental in bringing back the Mughal camp.

Ibrahim Adil Shah improved the system of keeping the accounts in Marathi and introduced the system of writing important documents in persian and in Marathi (Modi script). The bilingual official documents sometimes had the invocation of Sarasvatī, the Goddess of learning. * *Navarasamañjari* is an authentic literary source in Sanskrit, which testifies to the noble qualities of Ibrahim Adil Shah II of Bijapur.

* A. R. Kulkarni—"Social Relations in the Maratha Country" (Medieval period), Presidential Address, Indian Historical Congress, 1970.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Ahmed, Nazir, *Kitab-i-Navaras,* Lucknow, 1955.

2. Khare, G. H., *Mahārāṣṭra Mahodayācā Purvaraṅga* (Marathi,) Poona.

3. Sardesai, G. S., *New History of the Marathas,* Bombay, 1946.

4. Joshi, P. M., *The Kingdom of Bijapur,* University of London, 1936.

5. Joshi, P. M., "Position of Hindus in the Adil Adil Shahi Kingdom of Bijapur," *proceedings of the Deccan History Conference,* 1945.

Sarojini BHUYAN, Poona

THE ALAṄKĀRAS EMPLOYED IN THE BUDDHACARITA

Alaṁ karoti iti alaṁkāraḥ, that which decorates or adorns is an *alaṁkāra*. In poetry, so to say in the whole of the *kāvya* literature, it is the poetic embellishments or the figures of speech which adorn the *kāvya*. The Ṛgvedic poetry, which is usually considered to be the oldest form of poetry in the world literature, was a spontaneous flow from the heart of the Vedic seers. There is no reliable indication that they knew anything like the science of poetry. But the Vedic poets were fond of employing the *alaṁkāras* in poetry. They have used as many as 45 *alaṁkāras*[1] in the *Ṛgveda*, where we come across good examples of *Upamā* (*Ṛv*. I. 124, 7), *Rūpaka* (*Ṛv*. III.27,15 ; IX. 64, I), and *Atiśayokti* (*Ṛv*. I. 164,20). The *Upaniṣads* also contain highly poetic passages, in which examples of *Rūpaka alaṁkāra* (*Kaṭha*. I. 3, 3) are found. The *Nighaṇṭū* (III.13) has used near about 12 phrases from the *Ṛgveda* and names them as *Upamā*. The four *aṅgas* of *Upamā*, namely *upamāna*, *upameya* or *upamita*, *sādṛśya* and *sādṛśya vācaka śabdas* such as *iva*, *tulya*, etc. are seen in Pāṇinian *sūtras* like *upamānāni sāmānyavacanaiḥ* and *upamitaṁ vyāghrādibhiḥ sāmānyāprayoge* (P. II. I. 55-56) ; *tulyārthair atulopamābhyāṁ tṛtīyānyatarasyām* (P. II. 3. 72); *upamānād ācāre* (P. III. I. 10) ; and *tena tulyaṁ kriyā ced vati* (P. V. I. 115). The *Mahābhārata*, though more of a *dharmaśāstra* than a *kāvya*, contains a good number of verses in which the employment of both the *śabdālaṁkāras* and *arthālaṁkāras* like *Upamā*, *Anuprāsa*, *Rūpaka*, etc. is found. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* also, we find a large number of *alaṁkāras*. The Inscription of Rudradāman. (150 A. D.) clearly shows that before the second century A. D. both the *gadya* and the *padya* were required to be *alaṁkṛta*. *sarvakṣatrāviṣkṛtavīraśabdajātotsekavidheyānāṁ yaudheyānāṁ prasahyotsādakena...śabdārthagāndharvanyāyādyānāṁ vidyānāṁ mahatīnāṁ pāraṇadhāraṇavijñānaprayogāvāptavipulakīrtinā......sphuṭalaghumadhuracitrakāntaśabda samayodārālaṁkṛtagadyapadyasva.........yamadhigatamahākṣatrapanāmnā narendrakanyāsvayaṁvarānekamālyaprāptadāmnā mahākṣatrapeṇarudradāmnā.*

The words in the obove quotation also show the development of the *alaṁkāras* like *Anuprāsa* and *Yamaka*. The Nasik Inscriptions of Shripulumayi, somewhat earlier than that of Rudradāman, and the Inscription of Khāravela also show all the traits found in the Inscription of Rudradāman.

We come across the word *alaṁkāra* and its synonym *bhūṣaṇa* for the first time in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (*NŚ*. 17. 6. GOS, Vol. II. 350). The next available works on poetics are the *Kāvyālaṁkāra* of Bhāmaha and the *Kāvyādarśa* of Daṇḍin. Bhāmaha, the

founder of the *alaṁkāra* school of Sanskrit Poetics, gives more importance to the *alaṁkāras* in a poem and says that an unornamented poem does not attract the mind like the beautiful but unornamented face of a young lady (*K. Bha.* I. 13). Daṇḍin says : that which makes a *kāvya* beautiful is to be considered as an *alaṁkāra* (*K. A.* II. Ia). According to the *Agnipurāṇa* : *alaṁkārarahitā vidhaveva sarasvatī*/without *alaṁkāra* poetry appears like a widow (*A. P.* 344. 2a). Viśvanātha says that the *alaṁkāras* are like the ornaments on the human body (*S. D.* I. 3 Kārikā).

Aśvaghoṣa (latter half of the first century A. D.) had access to a fairly extensive list of *alaṁkāras*. In the *Buddhacarita* (*BC*) he has employed as many as 32 *alaṁkāras*. The *Ūpamā alaṁkāra*, as with any other poet, is the most favourite of Aśvaghoṣa and occurs in a good number of verses in the *BC*[3]. The similes employed by him are drawn from a wide range. Some similes are drawn from the world of Nature, some are purely religious and mythological, some are based on day-to-day life and some are purely psychological.

Similes from the World of Nature :

The Iotus :

The happy faces of city damsels gathered together near the windows, are compared with the bunches of lotus-flowers (III. 19, 2I); the faces of mourning damsels with tearful eyes in the palace, are compared with the dripping lotuses in a pond, whipped by the rains of the cloud (VIII.27,7I), a lady when bowed down with her ear-ring touching her painted cheek, is compared with a lotus having its stalk half-curved and as if shaken by a *kāraṇḍava* bird (V. 53) and the kingship, bringing delight and calamity at the same time, is compared with a lotus pond, crowded with crocodiles (IX. 4I).

The Sun :

The lustre of Siddhārtha's limbs illumining the darkness at the time of his birth, has been compared with the young sun coming down to the earth (I. I2) and the perfection of the growth of the young Siddhārtha, has been compared with the young sun on the Eastern mountain (II.20). The city Kapilavāstu without Siddhārtha, has been compared with the empty sky without the sun (III.5) and the strongly reserved king, with his diadem, has been compared to the mount Mandara, with the sun on its peak (VI. 13).

The Moon :

The attractive appearance of Siddhārtha in his early childhood had been compared with the moon in the bright fortnight (II.20); the prince proceeding to the city for an excursion, has been compared with the moon, with the constellations mounting the sky (III. 9) and the trembling mind of the prince has been compared

with the reflection of the moon on flowing water (III.45) and removing the grief of Rāhula, with the grace of Siddhārtha's presence has been compared with the full-moon freed from the eclipse by Rāhu (IX. 28).

The Animal world :

Similarly Aśvaghoṣa has drawn his similes from the animal world such as the elephant (III. 2; IV. 27; VI. 26), the lion (V. 1; XIII. 33), the cows (III. 4; VIII. 23), the trees (V. 29), the river (V. 49) and the ponds (VII. 27) very successfully.

Religious and Mythological :

Some similes of Aśvaghoṣa are religious and mythological. Such as the comparison of Siddhārtha and Yaśodhārā, with Indra and Śacī (II. 27), Siddhārtha with the damsels in the grove compared with Vivasvat surrounded by Apsarases in the Vibhrāja (IV. 28), Siddhārtha approaching the king Śuddhodana amidst his ministers, compared with Sanatkumāra approaching Maghavat in the assembly of the Maruts (V. 27); Chandaka leaving the prince in the forest compared with Sumantra leaving Rāghava (V. 36), the family-priest and the minister aproaching Siddhārtha, compared with Aurvaseya and Vāmadeva approaching Rāma (IX. 9); the paying of honour by the family-priest and the minister to the prince and getting the same from him compared with Śukra and the son of Aṅgīrasa paying honour to Indra and getting the same from him in heaven (IX. I0); and the family-priest and the minister, sitting close to the prince, compared with the twin stars of Punavasu in combination with the moon (IX. II).

Social Similes :

The similes employed in the sixth canto from verse 31-34, are based on day-to-day social life A nihilist, an ungrateful man, a coward and a mischievous man are employed respectively, as the *upamānas* here.

Psychological and Philosophical Similes :

Some similes of Aśvaghoṣa, are highly psychological and philosophical. The comparison of the world with a sick man (XIII.61), the five *śramaṇas* coming to Siddhārtha, as the sensual objects to a person, whose good works as ripe (XII. 89) and leaving the prince afterwards as the five elements leave a man on his release (XII. III) are the examples of such similes. The psychological similes come in a number of verses, while describing the hosts of Māra attacking Siddhārtha (XIII. 46-51) and while the charioteer requests the young Siddhārtha to return to the palace, leaving his ascetic life (VI. 31 ff.). According to C. W. GURNER, "The psychological interest is one of the outstanding characteristics of the Sanskrit poetry of Aśvaghoṣa."[3]

Utprekṣā has got a very good treatment at the hands of the poet (IV.3, 5, 47, 48; VII. 46 ; VIII. 37; XII. I, 4; III. 22). When the prince leaves the palace, the poet makes even the palace mourn because of his separation.

imāś ca vikṣiptaviṭaṁkabāhavaḥ
prasaktapārāvatadīrghnisvanāḥ /
vinākṛtāstena sahāvarodhanir
bhṛśaṁ rudantīva vimānapaṁktayaḥ //

"The rows of pavillions seem to weep with the women, casting up their pinnacles for arms and giving long sighs with the crying of their doves, in separation from him." (*BC* VIII. 37)

The employment of *Anuprāsa* is also favourite of *Aśvaghoṣa*. The poet has employed a good number of *Anuprāsas* in the *BC* (II. 32, 46; IV. 26d, 36, 75; V. 37; 87a; VII. 2, II, 39; VIII. 75; IX. 15, 25, 41, 46; X. 1, 2, 17, 33 and 39). Sometimes the repetition of the same syllables continues throughout the verse and sometimes it is found in the half or the quarter of the verse also. But such a repetition has got its own poetic charm and adds beauty to the epic no doubt.

Aśvaghoṣa is fond of employing the *Yamaka-alaṁkāras* also (II. 46; IV.75; IX. 28, 30; X.39).

The following *alaṁkāras*, though they do not occur frequently, are also found employed in the *BC*.

Arthāntaranyāsa : VIII. 35
Bhāvika : VIII. 52-53 and 55-58
Bhrāntimat : VII. 4ab
Dīpaka : II. 53
Ekāvalī : II. 53
Hetu : II. 37; III. 30
Kāvyaliṁga : I. 1 (C. Edn.), 4 (C. Edn.), III. 14, 17, 38; IV. 101.
Nidarśanā : I. 8 (C. Edn.); 28 (C. Edn.), 56
Parisaṁkhyā : II. 53
Punaruktavadābhāsa : II. 4
Prativastūpamā : I. 17 (C. Edn.)
Rasavat : VIII. 34
Rūpaka : I. 69-71; XI. 57; XII. 9, 66, IV. 40
Sahokti : V. 87
Samāsokti : I.6 (C. Edn.)
Sandeha : XIII. 7

Saṁkara : I.6 (C.Edn.): II.53; IV.46

Śleṣa : II.32: IX.15,25

Svabhāvokti : III.28,41

Tadguṇa : I.26 (C.Edn.)

Tulyayogitā : I.4 (C.Edn.)

Udātta : I.5 (C.Edn.); 17

Vibhāvanā : II.8

Virodhābhāsa : I.56; II.8a; I.10 (C.Edn.); 14 (C.Edn.); II.4

Viśeṣokti : II.9

Vyājatsuti : VIII.34

Vyatireka : I. 1 (C.Edn); 6 (C.Edn.)

Yathāsaṁkhya : V.26

Now if we look to the works on poetics available to us, the *NŚ* of Bharata is considered the earliest available work on dramaturgy, containing treatment of some of the topics of poetics. Bharata speaks of four *alaṁkāras* only, i. e. *Upamā*, *Rūpaka*, *Dīpaka* and *Yamaka*. (*NŚ* 16.43). The next available works on Poetics are the *Kāvyālaṁkāra* of Bhāmaha and the Kāvyādarśa of Daṇḍin. Both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin speak of 39 and 37 *alaṁkāras* respectively[4]. Aśvaghoṣa (latter half of the first century A. D.) supposed to have come before Bharata, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, has used as many as thirty one alaṁkāras in his *BC*. Now a comparative study can be done of the alaṁkāras of Aśvaghoṣa and the *alaṁkāras* of Bharata, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. The following table gives a comparative list af the *alaṁkāras*, employed by Bharata, Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Aśvaghoṣa.

Bharata	Bhāmaha	Daṇḍin	Aśvaghoṣa
1. *Dīpaka*	1. *Ākṣepa*	1. *Ākṣepa*	1. *Anuprāsa*
2. *Rūpaka*	2. *Ananvaya*	2. *Anuprāsa*	2. *Arthāntaranyāsa*
3. *Upamā*	3. *Anuprāsa*	3. *Apahnuti*	3. *Bhāvika*
4. *Yamaka*	4. *Apahnuti*	4. *Aprastutapraśaṁsā*	4. *Bhrantimat*
	5. *Aprastutapraśaṁsā*	5. *Arthāntaranyāsa*	5. *Dīpaka*
	6. *Arthāntaranyāsa*	6. *Āśiḥ*	6. *Ekāvalī*
	7. *Āśiḥ*	7. *Atiśayokti*	7. *Hetu*
	8. *Atiśayokti*	8. *Āvṛtti*	8. *Kāvyaliṁga*
	9. *Bhāvika*	9. *Bhāvika*	9. *Nidarśanā*
	10. *Dīpaka*	10. *Dīpaka*	10. *Parisaṁkhyā*
	11. *Nidarśanā*	11. *Hetu*	11. *Punaruktavadābhāsa*
	12. *Parivṛtti*	12. *Leśa or Lava*	12. *Prativastūpumā*

Bharata	Bhāmaha	Daṇḍin	Aśvaghoṣa
	13. *Paryayokta*	13. *Nidarśanā*	13. *Rasavat*
	14. *Prativastūpamā*	14. *Parivṛtti*	14. *Rūpaka*
	15. *Preyas*	15. *Paryāyokta*	15. *Sahokti*
	16. *Rasavat*	16. *Preyas*	16. *Samāsokti*
	17. *Rūpaka*	17. *Rasavat*	17. *Saṁkara*
	18. *Sahokti*	18. *Rūpaka*	18. *Sandeha*
	19. *Samāhita*	19. *Sahokti*	19. *Śleṣa*
	20. *Samāsokti*	20. *Samāhita*	20. *Svabhāvokti*
	21. *Saṁsṛṣṭi*	21. *Samāsokti*	21. *Tadguṇa*
	22. *Sasaṁdeha*	22. *Saṁkīrṇa*	22. *Tulyayogitā*
	23. *Sliṣṭa*	23. *Śleṣa*	23. *Udātta*
	24. *Svabhāvokti*	24. *Sūkṣma*	24. *Upamā*
	25. *Tulyayogitā*	25. *Svabhāvokti*	25. *Utprekṣā*
	26. *Udātta*	26. *Tulyayogitā*	26. *Vibhāvanā*
	27. *Upamā*	27. *Udātta*	27. *Virodhābhāsa*
	28. *Upamārūpaka*	28. *Upamā*	28. *Viśeṣokti*
	29. *Upameyopamā*	29. *Urjaśvi*	29. *Vyājastuti*
	30. *Urjasvi*	30. *Utprekṣā*	30. *Vyatireka*
	31. *Utprekṣā*	31. *Vibhāvanā*	31. *Yamaka*
	32. *Utprekṣāvayava*	32. *Virodha*	32. *Yathāsaṁkhya*
	33. *Vibhāvanā*	33. *Viśeṣokti*	
	34. *Virodha*	34. *Vyājokti*	
	35. *Viśeṣokti*	35. *Vyatireka*	
	36. *Vyājastuti*	36. *Yamaka*	
	37. *Vyatireka*	37. *Yathāsaṁkhya*	
	38. *Yamaka*		
	39. *Yathāsaṁkhya*		

From the above table, it will be found that the four *alaṁkāras* expounded by Bharata, are also recognised by both, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. But Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin differ from each other, while recognizing the new *alaṁkāras*, which are not found in Bharata. Bhāmaha denies *Hetu, Sūkṣma, Leśa* and *Vārtā* as *alaṁkāras* and does not discuss seven *alaṁkāras*, namely *Prativastūpamā* (variety of *Upamā*), *Upamārūpaka*, *Upameyopamā*, *Sasandeha*, *Ananvaya*, *Utprekṣāvayava* and *Saṃsṛṣṭi*, which are discussed by Bhāmaha as independent *alaṁkāras*. On the other hand, Daṇḍin treats also some new *alaṁkāras*, such as *Āvṛtti* and *Saṁkīrṇa* which are not treated as independent *alaṁkāras* by Bhāmaha. From the above fact, it can be presumed that if Daṇḍin comes after Bhāmaha, the three *alaṁkāras*, i. e. *Hetu*, *Sūkṣma* and *Leśa* (out of the four *alaṁkāras* denied by Bhāmaha as *alaṁkāras*) might have been recognised by Daṇḍin in course of time and that the seven *alaṁkāras* mentioned above, not found in Daṇḍin's

list, but recognized by Bhāmaha, might have lost their popularity, in course of time. On the other hand, if Bhāmaha comes after Daṇḍin, it can be inferred that the seven *alaṁkāras* mentioned above (not treated by Daṇḍin but found in Bhāmaha's list) might have developed in course of time after Daṇḍin and the other three mentioned above, namely ***Hetu, Sūkṣma*** and ***Leśa*** might have lost their popularity, so that Bhāmaha denied all the four as *alaṁkāras* (including *Vārtā* to the above list).

The number of the *alaṁkāras* employed by Aśvghoṣa, in his *BC* (thirtytwo) is near about the number of *alaṁkāras* enlisted by Bhāmaha (39) and Daṇḍin (37). But a good number of *alaṁkāras* are not found in Aśvaghoṣa, which are recognized by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, the following table gives the lists of such *alaṁkāras*.

Alaṁkāras recognised by Bhāmaha but not found in *BC*	*Alaṁkāras* recognised by Daṇḍin but not found in the *BC*
1. *Ākṣepa*	1. *Ākṣepa*
2. *Ananvaya*	2. *Apahnuti*
3. *Apahnuti*	3. *Aprastutapraśaṁsā*
4. *Aprastutapraśaṁsā*	4. *Āśiḥ*
5. *Āśiḥ*	5. *Atiśayokti*
6. *Atiśayokti*	6. *Āvṛtti*
7. *Parivṛtti*	7. *Leśa* or *Lava*
8. *Paryāyokta*	8. *Parivṛtti*
9. *Preyas*	9. *Paryāyokta*
10. *Samāhita*	10. *Preyas*
11. *Saṁsṛṣṭi*	11. *Samahita*
12. *Upamārūpaka*	12. *Saṁkīrṇa*
13. *Upameyopamā*	13. *Sūkṣma*
14. *Urjasvi*	14. *Urjasvi*
15. *Utprekṣāvayava*	

From the above table it can be inferred that a good number of *alaṁkāras*, which are not found to have ben employed by Aśvaghoṣa (Ist Cent. A. D.), developed during the intervening period betwen Aśvaghoṣa on the one hand and Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin on the other and were recognized by the latter two.

Aśvaghoṣa has also employed some *alaṁkāras* ,in his *BC*, which are not found in Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, but are found in some other later Poeticians. These are : ***Bhrāntimat, Ekāvalī, Kāvyaliṁga, Parisaṁkhyā, Punaruktavadābhāsa*** and *Tadguṇa*.

The study of the *alaṁkāras* employed by Aśvaghoṣa is important because there is a wide gap of time between Aśvaghoṣa on the one hand and Bhāmaha & Daṇḍin on

other and also because no work on poetics of this period is available to us. Hence, it helps us to know how many new *alaṁkāras* have developed during the intervening period.

NOTES

1. Pralhadkumarah, *Ṛgveda Alaṁkārāḥ*, New Delhi, 1977, viṣayānukramaṇika pp. 5-7.

2. *BC* (I .10, 12-14, 21, 52, 58, 72, 73, 87-89; II. 1, 20, 27, 32; III. 2, 9, 12-21, 45; IV.27, 28, 33, 49, 70; V. 1, 27, 29, 41, 43, 51-53, 79; VI. 13, 26, 31-34, 36, 57, 65 ; VIII. 5, 8, 12, 13, 22-24, 26, 27, 59, 71, 73, 81; IX. 9-12, 26, 27, 41, 43, 74; X. 15, 18, 19; XI. 68; XII. 5, 7, 98, 99.)

3. GURNER C.W., "The Psychological Simile in Aśvaghoṣa", *JAS Beng.*, *NS* XXVI, 1930, p. 175.

4. An alphabetical list of *alaṁkāras* defined by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, is given in KANE, P.V., *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Delhi, Fourth Edition, 1971, pp. 148-151.

Satya Vrat SHASTRI, Puri :

FATE IN KĀLIDĀSA

A careful perusal of the works of Kālidāsa shows his strong belief in fate. There is so frequent a mention of it in his works and so many incidents are ascribed to its working that it is impossible to conceive of him not believing in its all-powerful role. भवितव्यता, भाग्य, भागधेय, विधि, दैव, नियति, कृतान्त are some of the words by which he designates it in the *Vikramorvaśīya* when one of Bharata's pupils says that during a performance Urvaśī in the role of Lakṣmī on being asked as to whom among Keśava and the Lokapālas she is attached, she, through slip of tongue utters the word Purūravas instead of Puruṣottama (Keśava), the other pupil remarks : भवितव्यानुविधायीनीन्द्रियाणि,[1] , the senses proceed according to what is destined. There is reference to fate again in the same play under the different word दैव in the context of the King's union with his son and his imminent separation from Urvaśī : अहो सुखप्रत्यर्थिता दैवस्य[2], Oh : the opposition of fate to happiness (due to the condition imposed by Indra on the latter having been cursed by Bharata for her slip of tongue in pronouncing the word Purūravas in place of Puruṣottama that she could be with Purūravas only till she sees her son's face).

In the *Mālavikāgnimitra* Irāvatī, the queen of Agnimitra is seen to be cross with him to find him with Mālavikā. She leaves in a huff in disregard of his entreaties. She softens later and comes to meet him to find the same scene back again. To notice her feelings ruffled the jester tells her that the King had forgotten the impropriety of ignoring his efforts to placate her but that has not reconciled her. The King also tells her that her anger is improper which does not befit her. With a pungent irony Irāvatī remarks that the King has rightly said 'improper'. She refers to the King's love for her as her luck and says that with that transferred to some one else, if she were to feel angry, she would look ridiculous : अन्यसङ्क्रान्तेषु अस्माकं भागधेयेषु यदि पुनः कुप्येयं तदा हास्या भवेयम्[3] ।

Fate is referred to again in the work in the context of the blossoming of the Aśoka tree with the stroke of Mālavikā's foot. Its female garden keeper mentions this with the feeling that the event would please the Chief Queen who through jealousy had otherwise been very hard to her : अहो ! दैवस्यानुकम्पनीया मालविका[4], 'Oh, Fate has taken pity on Mālavikā'. Fate still again is an object of reference in the work when at the query of the King on learning from the two artist maids sent as present from the Vidarbha country that Mālavikā is the younger sister of Prince Mādhavasena who had been released from confinement after defeating the Vidarbha ruler, as to how she had come

to such a pass : अथात्भवती कथमित्थम्भूता ?[5] she says to herself (आत्मगतम्) विधिनियोगेन[6], through a play of fate. Kauśiki's refering to herself as मन्दभाग्या[7], unfortunate, also underlines the play of fate in shaping of events, which she proceeds to narrate from where the maids had finished : अतः परमहं मन्दभाग्या कथयिष्यामि ।

In the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* fate is referred to a number of times. There is reference to it in the very beginning of the work itself. When Duṣyanta in persuit of a deer in a forest enters a hermitage, he notices the throbbing in the arms, an indication of something good coming which he is not able to make out that time. He then says :

शान्तमिदमाश्रमपदं स्फुरति च बाहुः कुतः फलमिहास्य ।
अथवा भवितव्यानां द्वाराणि भवन्ति सर्वत्र ॥ [8],

there are openings every where for what are predestined. Fate is referred to again when a hermit informs Duṣyanta at the latter's query whether Kaṇva is in the hermitage that he (Kaṇva) has gone to Somatīrtha for appeasing the adverse fate of Śakuntalā entrusting her with the duty of honouring guests : शकुन्तलामतिथिसत्काराय नियुज्य दैवमस्याः प्रतिकूलं शमयितुं सोमतीर्थं गतः[9], *Kaṇva* while delivering a message for Duṣyanta at Śakuntalā's departure for his capital also refers to it. He tells him to treat her the same way as he treats his other wives keeping him in mind as also his noble lineage and his love for her. He need not add anything more to it, says he (Kaṇva) for, beyond this everything depends upon fate : भाग्यायत्तमतः परम्[10], meaning thereby that it is fate alone which is to determine how, inspite of all this, things are to turn out. The next time fate is referred to is when Śakuntalā having been repudiated by Duṣyanta finds fault with it : सा निन्दन्ती स्वानि भाग्यानि बाला[11]

The nymph Sānumatī keeping an invisible watch over the actions of Duṣyanta makes a reference to it when she hears remorseful Duṣyanta say after the discovery of the ring that his heart which remained asleep even after it was being awakened by Śakuntalā was now broad awake to suffer the agony of remorse, नन्वीदृशानि तपस्विन्या भागधेयानि[12], such is the lot of the poor (creature). Fate is referred to again when in the jasmine grove, Mādhavīmaṇḍapa, at the King's query to the jester as to whether he, like him, too had forgotten about Śakuntalā not having mentioned her name any time, the jester replies : far from it. After telling him everything about his affair with her, he (the King) had told him finally that it was only a joke and not a fact and that he, the dullard (*mṛtpiṇḍabuddhi*), had taken it as such. As a post-cript to the above the jester adds : अथवा भवितव्यता खलुवत्र बलवती[13], or what is destined is indeed here inexorable.' As the jester and the King continue, the former asks the latter as to what for he had placed the ring in Śakuntalā's hand, the latter says that he had done so at the time of his departure from the hermitage for his capital to tell her to count the days as

per the number of syllables in the name inscribed on it. By the time she would come upon the last of it, a person would appear to escort her to his harem which out of infatuation he did not do. The nymph Sānumatī listening invisibly to the above refers to fate and ascribes to it the frustration of the aforesaid arrangement : रमणीयः खल्ववधिर्विधिना विसंवादितः[14] ।

The next reference to fate is when Śakuntalā talking to herself in Mārīca's Āśrama after hearing the news of the herb retaining its natural form and not undergoing a metamorphosis (which it would if touched by one other than parents and ones own self) even after being lifted up by Duṣyanta, says : विकारकालेऽपि प्रकृतिस्थां सर्वदमनस्यौषधिं श्रुत्वा न मे आशाऽऽसीदात्मनो भागधेयेषु[15], "even though I heard that Sarvadamana's herb remained in its natural form even at the time of matamorphosis, I had no hope about my fortune. She further refers to it when she most unexpectedly, comes face to face with Duṣyanta : परित्यक्तमत्सरेणानुकम्पिताऽस्मि दैवेन[16], 'the fate has shown mercy to me.' Fate is referred to next when at Bharata's query to Śakuntalā as to who the stranger—he does not know that he is his father Duṣyanta who had earlier lifted him up and is now engaged in conversation with his mother—is Śakuntalā says : वत्स ते भागधेयानि पृच्छ[17], child, ask your luck. That was to be the fate of the young one that he was to enquire about his own father as to who he is. And this is the last time that there is reference to fate in the play.

Fate is referred to in Kālidāsa's works not only by any of its wellknown names but also by the good or the bad result of the actions in the previous births. This is what is done in the context of Sītā's exile in the *Raghuvaṁśa* where Sītā ascribes her repudiation to the sin of her previous births : ममैव जन्मान्तरपातकानां विपाकविस्फूर्जथुरप्रसह्यः[18] । Śakuntalā also does the same when she, noticing Duṣyanta penitent at what he had done to her,remarks : नूनं मे सुचरितप्रतिबन्धकं पुराकृतं तेषु दिवसेषु परिणामाभिमुखमासीद्येन सानुक्रोशोऽप्यार्यपुत्रो मयि तथाविधः संवृत्तः[19], indeed in those days a bad deed done earlier (in earlier births) was beginning to show result in that my husband even though kind to me had turned to be so.

While treating Kālidāsa's belief in fate, it will be out of point not to say a word about his use of the words for the same. It is interesting to note his use of the words भाग्य and भागधेय in plural : अन्यसङ्क्रान्तहृदयेष्वस्माकं भागधेयेषु[20], सा निन्दन्ती स्वानि भाग्यानि बाला[21], नन्वीदृशानि तपस्विन्या भागधेयानि[22], न मे आशाऽऽसीदात्मनो भागधेयेषु[23], वत्स ते भागधेयानि पृच्छ[24] . Fate is always singular, nowhere is it fates. Why then भाग्यानि and not भाग्यम् or भागधेयानि and not भागधेयम् ? Probable it is that the

plural here refers to the series of fateful incidents that have led to the unhappy consummation. The plural in भाग्यानि in सा निन्दन्ती स्वानि भाग्यानि बाला suggests the different vicissitudes of Śakuntalā's life.[25] Her falling in love with a stranger (*ajñātahṛdaya*), his mind unknown, the slipping of her ring in Somatīrtha, her repudiation by Duṣyanta and her mortification at that. The plural in भागधेयानि in ईदृशानि तपस्विन्या भागधेयानि refers to the chance turn of events : Durvāsā's curse, the loss of the signet ring by which the king's heart even though awakened again and again remained asleep and its accidental discovery.[26] The same in वत्स ते भागधेयानि पृच्छ refers to the strange turn of events that have led to the present consummation in father and the son not knowing each other and may also shape things one way or the other. भागधेयानि suggests everything : Bharata's birth after his mother's repudiation, his upbringing, even though a prince, in a hermitage in the company of hermits and the wild beings as also the possibilities, as explained by KALE, one, of Bharata being accepted as his son by the king and his becoming an emperor one day, and the other, of his spending his whole life in a hermitage.[27]

An explanation along the same line could well be possible for the plural in भागधेयेषु both in अन्यसङ्क्रान्तहृदयेष्वस्माकं भागधेयेषु[28] of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* and न म आशासीदात्मनो भागधेयेषु[29], of the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*. A far better explanation for plural in all the cases cited above could well be that it refers to the actions, good or bad, of the previous births which result in fruits, good or bad, in the present one. These actions when taken severally need plural for expression; when taken collectively need singular : भाग्यम् , दैवम् , विधिः , कृतान्तः , etc. Hence the use of both by Kālidāsa. Though plausible, both the explanations leave the question of the exclusive use of plural in भागधेय by Kālidāsa unanswered. Could it be due just to current usage ?

As for the poem of Kālidāsa, there is no mention of fate in the ***Ṛtusaṁhāra***. In the *Meghadūta*, however, there is reference to it in four places. In the very beginning of the work the Yakṣa refers to his mendicancy before cloud on account of his separation from his dear one due to (adverse) fate : तेनार्थित्वं त्वयि विधिवशाद् दूरबन्धुर्गतोऽहम्[30], Later, while telling the cloud about the likely condition of his consort in his absence he (the Yakṣa) again refers to fate due to which her thigh has to do without the wonted net of pearls : मुक्ताजालं चिरपरिचितं त्याजितो दैवगत्या[31]. Still later in the message to the cloud he makes mention of the adverse fate blocking his way in making him unite, through the imaginative faculty, his body with that of his beloved : अङ्गेनाङ्गं ..सङ्कल्पैस्तैर्विशति विधिना वैरिणा रुद्धमार्गः[32],

Further on he ascribes to fate absence of union with the beloved even in dream by robbing him of the sight by ever-increasing torrent of tears :

अस्रैस्तावन्मुहुरुपचितैर्दृष्टिरालुप्यते मे
क्रूरस्तस्मिन्नपि न सहते सङ्गमं नौ कृतान्तः ॥[33]

The *Raghuvaṁśa* mentions fate in half a dozen places, first time in the context of the chance development of friendship between Priyaṁvada, a Gandharva Prince, rescued by an accidental shot of an arrow from elephanthood imposed upon him by sage Mataṁga and Raghu, the scion of the Ikṣvākus on the way to Indumatī's Svayaṁvara :

एवं तयोरध्वनि दैवयोगादासेदुषोः सख्यमचिन्त्यहेतु[34],

The next mention of fate is in the context of the comparison of Indumatī's turning away from the Kaliṁga ruler, though tempted by Sunanda, as does the goddess of a fortune from an unfortunate fellow though brought from a distance by him through exertion :

तस्मादपावर्तत दूरकृष्टा नीत्येव लक्ष्मीः प्रतिकूलदैवात्[35],

Aja in his lamentations as the death of Indumatī refers to fate three times. He is not able to make out as to how even flowers, the most delicate of the things, could take away the life of a person. If they even can do so, argues he, what other things could not be enough for fate, if only it is to strike.

कुसुमान्यपि गात्रसङ्गमात्प्रभवन्त्यायुरपोहितुं यदि ।
न भविष्यति हन्त साधनं किमिवान्यत् प्रहरिष्यतो विधेः ॥[36]

He thinks that it is due to his adverse fate that the creator turned the garland into thunderbolt :

अथवा मम भाग्यविप्लवादशनिः कल्पित एष वेधसा[37],

He blames his own deeds, what actually fate is, for what has befallen him :

सहतां हतजीवितं मम प्रबलामात्मकृतेन वेदनाम् ॥[38]

The next and the last reference to fate in the work is when, after Sītā is carried to the nether world by the earth and the agitated Rāma takes up his bow to get her back from her (the earth), Vālmīki and Vasiṣṭha pacify him by letting him of the inexorableness of the working of fate :

गुरुर्विधिबलापेक्षी शमयामास धन्विनः[39],

Fate finds mention in the first eight cantos of the *Kumārasambhava*, generally accepted to be genuine, in at least four places : out of which three pertain to Rati after

the burning of Kāma. In the earliest of these fate is said to be wishing to make Rati regain consciousness with a desire to making her experience new widowhood with its unbearable pangs :

अथ मोहपरायणा सती विवशा कामवधूर्विबोधिता ।
विधिना प्रतिपादयिष्यता नववैधव्यमसह्यवेदनम् ॥[10]

Rati on regaining herself indulges in the moot pathetic lamentations. She accuses fate to have cheated the world : विधिना जन एष वञ्चितः[11], it is on Kāma that the happiness of the people depends : त्वदधीनं खलु देहिनां सुखम्[12], While addresing Vasanta, the friend of her husband, she charges fate with committing half the butchery in killing Kāma while sparing her : विधिना कृतमर्धवैशसं ननु मां कामवधे विमुञ्चता[13],

The fourth reference to fate is in the context of drinking of wine offered by the presiding deity of the Gandhamādana forest by Pārvatī and undergoing a change thereby which though a change was attractive like the common mango tree changing into the Sahakāra kind due to the inscrutable working of fate :

अप्रतर्क्यविधियोगकारितामाम्रतेव सहकारतां ययौ[14],

With so much of prominence of fate in Kālidāsa's works one is tempted to ask the question : Was Kālidāsa a fatalist ? Did he believe that everything was predestined, determined by actions, good or bad in previous births ? Did he believe in independence of action in any form in the present birth ? It is difficult to answer this question with a degree of poecision. Kālidāsa does seem to believe in independent action to a point after which he appears to resign himself to fate. This seems to come out of the message of Kaṇva for Duṣyanta. He first asks the latter to do this or to do that. Soon thereafter he leaves everything to fate : भाग्यायत्तमतः परम् ! Man can go in shaping things to a certain extent only beyond which he has no control over them and has to follow the path charted out for him by Destiny.

NOTES

The following editions of Kālidāsa's works have been used in this article :

Vikramorvaśīya, (*Vikra.*) ed. Shankar Pandurang PANDIT, Sanskrit Series No. XVI, Bombay, 1901.

Mālavikāgnimitra, (*Mal.*) ed. M. R. KALE, The Standard Publishing Co., Bombay, 1918.

Abhijñānaśākuntala (*Abh. Śa.*), ed. M. R. KALE, Gopal Narayan & Co., Bombay, 1920.

Raghuvaṁśa (*Ragh.*), Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1920.

Kumārasambhava (*Ku. Sam.*), ed. M. R. KALE, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1981.

Meghadūta (*Megh.*), ed. M. R. KALE, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1974.

---

1. *Vikra.*, Act III, p. 71.
2. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 161.
3. *Mal.*, Act IV, p. 85.
4. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 89.
5. *ibid.*, p. 89.
6. *ibid.*
7. *ibid.*
8. *Abh.Śa.*, Act I, p.15.
9. *ibid.*, Act. I, p.15.
10. *ibid.*, IV,17.
11. *ibid.*, V,30.
12. *ibid.*, Act VI, p.150.
13. *Abh. Śa.*, Act VI, p.152.
14. *ibid.*, p.156.
15. *ibid.*, Act VII, p.192.
16. *ibid.*, p.193.
17. *Abh.Śa.*, Act VII, p.194.
18. *Ragh.*, IV.62.
19. *Abh.Sa.*, Act VII, p.194.
20. *Mal.*, Act IV, p.85.
21. *ibid.*, V,30.
22. *ibid.*, Act VI, p.150.
23. *ibid.*, Act VII, p.192.
24. *ibid.*, Act VII, p.194.
25. That also is M. R. KALE's view. See his note, p.129.
26. KALE merely attempts the sense of भागधेयानि here when he interprets it as adverse luck, दुरदृष्ट of the *Kumārasantoṣiṇī* of Ramendra Mohan BOSE (Atma Ram & sons, Lahore, p. 583.), see his Notes pp. 138-9. He does not explain the plural in the form.

27. GAJENDRAGADKAR's Comment :

The natural but very touching question of Sarvadamana as to who Duṣyanta was brings to Śakuntalā's mind all her previous history, commencing her first meeting with the king. She realizes what important past divinity has played in shaping the ends of her life and replies to Sarvadamana that he should appeal to his own fortunes to get an answer to his question. It was impossible for Śakuntalā to give a direct and definite reply to her son's innocent but so dreadfully touching question. *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, Seventh Edition, The Popular Pusblishing House, Surat, 1962.

28. KALE interprets it as 'our good luck, being loved by you'. (see Notes p. 99.) having got transferred to some one else. There is no comment of his or DEVACHAR's or of anybody else on the plural used.

29. Here also भागधेयेषु explained by KALE, see his Notes p.163, as 'good fortune' or स्वकीयसौजन्यजन्यस्वामिप्राप्तिविषये of the *Kumārasantoṣiṇī* of Kamendra Mohan BOSE, leaves the plural unexplained. It may, as in other cases, refer to the strange turn of events, her being in the upper regions and the coming of her husband there of his own accord to receive her back.

30. *Pūrvamegha*, verse 6.

31. *Uttaramegha*, verse 35.

32. *ibid.*, verse 41.

33. *Uttarmegha*, verse 44.

34. *Ragh*. V. 60

35. *ibid.*, VI. 58.

36. *ibid.*, VIII. 44.

37. *ibid.*, VIII. 47.

38. *ibid.*, VIII. 50.

39. *Ragh.*, XV. 85.

40. *Ku. Sam.*, IV. 1.

41. *ibid.*, IV. 10.

42. *ibid.*,

43. *ibid.*, IV. 31.

44. *ibid.*, VIII. 78.

S. D. LADDU, Poona

SOCIAL LEAD FROM ANCIENT INDIAN GRAMMARIANS

(I) The State of Sanskrit & of Sanskrit Education before Christ :

The relevancy of Rules in the Grammar of Pāṇini (P), the implication of critical Notes on them in the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana (Kty), and a number of direct and indirect references scattered throughout the Great Commentary of Patañjali (Ptj) have long back proved the spoken nature of Sanskrit during the period of these grammarians.[1]

It is therefore easy to know how such a living tongue, which was actually current in everyday use at home and outside, could be open to influences from various quarters wherever it was employed in social communication.[2] The problem before the parents and the teachers then was not how to teach Sanskrit to the younger generation, from the beginning or as a new or second language, but how to teach it to them as a correct, elegant or acceptable idiom.

As times passed and as differences from the norm of P became glaring,[3] the danger was distinctly felt of the Sanskrit of P undergoing corruption; and, as WHITNEY said, it is not customary that a language has its proper usages fixed by rule until it faces such a situation.[4] It would not be difficult to imagine how the Sanskrit speech then experienced wonderful fights between (i) those who sticked to the Rules laid down by P and/or Kty (*lakṣaṇaikacakṣuska*) and (ii) those who were wanting to accept the rising usages which were not fully sanctioned by P or Kty (*lakṣaṇaikaca-kṣuṣka*).

The task to satisfy, or at least to pacify, the heated arguments of both the extremists, by giving a judgment acceptable to both, is always a very difficult and delicate one, and it was so with Kty and Ptj. But both these Munis of Sanskrit Grammar did the job remarkably well, and especially Ptj played the role of a tight-rope walker with such success as to claim highest authority for verdicts coming from him.[5]

How could they do this ? What were the principles that guided them ? It should be rewarding to go to these questions.

(II) Kātyāyana's Principles :

1. Kty mentions an important principle, *viz* the significatory power *i. e.* actual usage (*abhidhāna*), as being at work behind the suffix-ending words *i. e.* the primary and secondary derivations and the compounds.[6] Conversely, he also mentions denial of sanction to grammatically correct formations if they are not in usage (*anabhidhāna*)[7]. And this fact indicates how he is strong on his principle. For, he held that an expression carried 'naturalness' in its currency.[8]

2. However, although usage primarily came from, or was fixed by, the community of speakers (*Loka*), it was, according to Kty, the duty of the Science (*Śāstra*) to channelise it properly and to pronounce its preferences for the 'good' of the society (*dharmaniyama*).[9] This may be said to be the supreme function (*prayojana*) of the Science. For, even though usage has got 'established' (*Siddha, nitya*) ths Science must perform its duty of prohibiting some unwanted usages.[10] Even one of the ideas behind preparing the Inventory of Roots (*Dhātu-pāṭha*) was to allow no scope to corrupt verbal stems then found used by some, like *āṇapavati* (or *vaṭṭati, vaḍḍhati, kasi, diśi, etc.*)[11]

(III) Patañjali's Procedure :

The position of Ptj became more delicate and difficult. By his time, a large number of corrupt forms grew in the Sanskrit speech around correct expressions which went into minority. Take the case of '*go*'. Not less than four expressions were used in its stead : *gāvī, goṇī, gotā, gopotalikā.*[12] Poor *Devadatta* also could be referred to by the term *Devadiṇṇa.*[13] What was Ptj's reaction and lead in such situations ?

1. He too accepted that speech arose from the people, that expressions were rooted among the *people*. A user of language—a speaker, a writer, an orator—does not go to the house of a Grammarian and ask him to mint good words for him, just as one would go to a potter's shop for having a pot. But he would fall back upon the stock of expressions already current in the society.[14]

2. (a) Nevertheless, the growing tendency of his times of using, sporadically not just one or two, but quite a number of incorrect expressions (as was seen earlier) disturbed him. Good words were relatively few, wrong words were many. Virtue was scarce, vice was rampant ! He expected people to follow the good as it was backed by the Science, *i. e.* to use *Devadatta etc.*, not *Devadiṇṇa etc.*[15] They should not claim to know everything of secular utterance on the strength of acquaintance with usage current in any section of the society.[16]

2.(b) But, it may be asked, who is to decide which particular word is good and which is bad, which is grammatically correct and which is not ? Who is to make this judgment and *choice* of a good word ? Again, different users might have different choices, and there can be confusing situations.

Ptj's answer to this recommends reliance on the usage of the cultured people (*śiṣṭa-prayoga*). They have mastered the Science and should be treated as guides. There is an interesting discussion carried by Ptj in this connection[17] on P's sūtra 6.3.109.

3. Social usage, however, was rapidly changing, and allegiance to the verdicts coming from a Grammarian (*vaiyākaraṇa*) or from a Cultured Person (*śiṣṭa*) could not be commanded easily. Probably there were a number of forms whose use was favoured (*iṣṭa*) by the common man or the man in the street in contrast with their parallels that were prescribed by grammar because they were obtained (*prāpta*) by regular application of the rules of grammar. Ptj himself narrates an anecdote where a grammarian referring to a chariot driver as *pravetā* was modestly corrected by the latter to use the form *prājitā*.[18] Here then was a case of *iṣṭi* or *loka-svīkāra* asserting its importance side by side with *prāpti* or *śāstra-puraskāra*. As Krishna Chaitanya has pointed out;[19] "Patañjali was well aware that the organic vitality of popular speech cannot be contained by the rules of the grammarian."

4. But despite such growing demands for the sanction of newly arising ungrammatical expressions, despite the fact that they possessed communicability or significatory power (*gamakatva*), Ptj would not yield to the disorder that in effect they created. His highest concern was for maintaining order or system (*vyavasthā*) in the use of the language. His liberal attitude was not to be misunderstood, and misused. Thus, while, after P's use of the ungrammatical expression *anapuṁsaka* in his own Rule (1. 1. 43), he allowed the use of 'some' understandable (*gamaka*) but, unsyntactic compounds (*asamarthasamāsa-s*) like *asūryampasya*, *apunargeya*, *aśrāddhabhojin* or *alavaṇabhojin*, he withdrew sanction to more such compounds like *akiñcitkurvāṇa*, *amāṣaṁharamāṇa* and *agādhādutkṛṣṭa*. For, his allowance was of a restrictive nature (*niyamārtha*). He also praises the practice of the learned sages who took liberty to utter expressions like *yadvā naḥ*, *tadvā naḥ* as *yarvāṇastarvāṇaḥ*, because that was done only in informal speech.[20]

(IV) Concluding Remarks :

It can thus be seen that, while Kty accepted the principles of 1. the Society (*loka*) as well as 2. the Science (*Śāstra*), Ptj accepted the following four :

1. Society (*loka*) or the common man's desire (*iṣṭi*),[21]
2. Prescriptions of the Science (*śāstra*),

3. Usage of the Cultured (*śiṣṭa-prayoga*), and

4. System in the use of speech (*vyavasthā*).

It becomes obvious that Ptj's attempt was to effect a balance between the conflicting trends, by discouraging large-scale disorder in the use of the language while at the same time giving scope to the linguistic urges of the rising generation. As a grammarian, he is all out in emphasizing the importance of the Theory of the Science with its prescriptions. As a man of the society who realises his obligations to the common man who cannot undergo the laborious training in grammar, he loosens the rope round his neck to a sufficient degree by allowing him use of the expressions which have gained wide currency or popularity though they may not be strictly sanctioned by the rules of grammar.

This is the position of Reconciliation which befits a leader who possesses wider social interests, and wants to create social harmony without compromising the basic scientific stand.

NOTES

1. See i) KEITH, *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, 1928, p. 9.
   ii) RENOU, *Histoire de la langua Sanscrite*, 1956, p.74, fn.1.
   iii) K. B. PATHAK, "The Age of Pāṇini and Sanskrit as a spoken Language", *ABORI* (1930) 11. 59-83.
   iv) R. G. BHANDARKAR, *JBBRAS* 16.335f. (=*Collected Works* IV. 583).
2. See i) F. W. THOMAS, *JRAS* (1904), p.469.
   ii) Vidhushekhara BHATTACHARYA, "Pāṇini's Grammar and the Influence of Prakrit on Sanskrit", *IL* (1933) 3.157-59.
   iii) S. M. KATRE, "The Influence of Popular Dialects on Sanskrit," *ABORI* (1943) 24.9-26.
   iv) S. D. LADDU, "Prakritic Influences Revealed in the Works of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali", *Proceedings of the Seminar in Prakrit Studies*, Gujarat Univ. Ahmedabed, pp.88-100.
3. See A. M. GHATAGE, *ALB* (1961) 25.107f.
4. Introduction, XIV, to *Sanskrit Grammar* (1889), 7th issue, 1950.
5. See Kaiyaṭa on *Mahābhāṣya* : i) मुनिद्वयाच्च भाष्यकारः प्रमाणतरम् at (2.4.26.7);
   ii) यथोत्तरं हि मुनित्रयस्य प्रामाण्यम् (at 1.1.29).
6. See S. D. LADDU, *Evolution of the Sanskrit Language from Pāṇini to Patañjali*, 1974, (Introduction :) 34f.
7. See S. D. LADDU, *loc. cit.*, 35.
8. Vide his vārttika : अभिधानं पुनः स्वाभाविकम् (I.2.64.33=2.2.29.15)

9. See *Mahābhāṣya* (*M*) KIELHORN's ed., I. 8.1-2 (यदि तर्हि लोक एषु प्रमाणं, किं शास्त्रेण क्रियते ?), followed by the *Vārttika* :
"लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे, शास्त्रेण धर्मनियमः ।"
10. See 1.1.1.10 : 'किमर्थं शास्त्रम्' इति चेत्, निवर्तकत्वात् सिद्धम् ।
11. See Vt., 1. 3. 1. 12 : भूवादिपाठः प्रातिपदिकाणपयत्यादिनिवृत्त्यर्थः, and *M* (I. 259. 6f :) के पुनराणपयत्यादयः । आणपयति, वट्टति, वड्ढति इति । and (I. 259. 14 :) लोके हि कृष्यर्थे कसिं प्रयुञ्जते, दृश्यर्थे च दिसिम् ।
12. See *M* (I. 2. 23-25, 10.8-9 :) भूयांसोऽपशब्दा अल्पीयांसः शब्दाः । एकैकस्य हि शब्दस्य बहवोऽपभ्रंशाः । तद्यथा । 'गौर्' इत्यस्य शब्दस्य 'गावीगोणीगोतागोपोतलिका' इत्येवमादयोऽपशब्दाः ।
13. See *M* (I. 20, 12 :) देवदत्तशब्दो देवदिण्णशब्दं निवर्तयति, न गाव्यादीन् ।
14. See *M* (I. 7. 28-8.1 :) घटेन कार्यं करिष्यन् कुम्भकारकुलं गत्वाह "कुरु घटं, कार्यमनेन करिष्यामि" इति । तद्वत् शब्दान् प्रयोक्ष्यमाणो वैयाकरणकुलं गत्वाह "कुरु शब्दान्, प्रयोक्ष्ये" इति
15. See *M* (I. 20. 11-12 :) समाने चार्थे शास्त्रान्वितोऽशास्त्रान्वितस्य निवर्तको भवति । तद्यथा । देवदत्तशब्दो दिवदिण्णशब्द निवर्तयति, न गाव्यादीन् ।
16. See *M* (I. 5. 9 :) वेदान्नो वैदिकाः शब्दा सिद्धा लोकाच्च लौकिकाः ।
17. See *M* III. 174.4-15 : also, KEITH to whom such a situation suggests "a close parallel to modern conditions in England, when an upper educational class sets norm to all those in lower social classes." (*A History*, p. 11).
18. See *M* (I. 488. 18-20 :) एवं हि कश्चिद्वैयाकरण आह । "कोऽस्यरथस्य प्रवेता ?" इति । सूत आह । "आयुष्मन्नहं प्राजिता" इति । वैयाकरण आह । "अपशब्द" इति । सूत आह । "प्राप्तिज्ञो देवानांप्रियो, नत्विष्टिज्ञ, इष्यत एतद्रूपम्" इति ।
19. See *A New History of Sanskrit Literature*, 1962, p. 28.
20. See *M* (I. 11, 11-14 :) एवं हि श्रूयते । यर्वाणस्तर्वाणो नामर्षयो बभूवुः प्रत्यक्षधर्माणः परापरज्ञा विदितवेदितव्या अधिगतयाथातथ्याः । ते तत्रभवन्तो "यद्वा नस्तद्वा नः" इति प्रयोक्तव्ये, "यर्वाणस्तर्वाणः" इति प्रयुञ्जते, याज्ञे पुनः कर्मणि नापभाषन्ते ।
21. *Cp.* also R. H. ROBINS stating that it is "the cardinal principle of linguistics" that "language must always, and in every analysis, be studied as a part of social process and social activity and every utterance must be considered and understood within its context or situation". (*Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe*, 1961, pp. 91 f.).

R. Ṣ. BHATTACHARYA, Varanasi

A WRONG EXPLANATION OF THE WORD NĀRĀYAṆA BY DR. BHANDARKAR

Dr. R. G. BHANDARKAR observes : The word Nārāyaṇa is similar to Nāḍāyana, which last is formed by Pāṇini 4.1.99 and means the *gotra* Nāḍāyana. The termination is significative and means in this case the resting place or the place to which Nāḍa or a Collection of Nadas go. So Nārāyaṇa means the resting place or goal of Nāra or a collection of naras; see Medhātithi's commentary on Manu 1.10 (Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism *etc.*, p.30).

From the above passage it appears that according to Dr. BHANDARKAR (i) the word Nārāyaṇa (in Manu 1.10) is similar to Nāḍāyana so far as the formation of the word is concerned; (ii) Nāḍāyana is the name of a *gotra* and (iii) the termination (*i. e.* the suffix, precisely the secondary, *taddhita* suffix) *āyana* in the word Nārāyaṇa (in Manu 1.10) means the resting place, or the place to which anything goes.

According to us all of these views are wrong as the following consideration would show.

It is not quite correct to hold that the word Nāḍāyana derived from the word Naḍa (according to Pāṇini 4.1.99) is the name of the *gotra* called Nāḍāyana. Pāṇinian *gotra* is a *pāribhāṣika śabda* (technical word) of grammar meaning any descendent beginning with the grandson (*vide* Pāṇini 4.1.162). Thus Nāḍāyana means any descendent beginning with the grandson of a wellknown pre-Pāṇinian person named Naḍa. This *gotra* was called *vṛddha* by some pre-Pāṇinian - teachers and it has no connection with the secular (*laukika*) *gotra* as shown in the works on *Dharmaśāstra*. If the name Nāḍāyana occurs in the lists of *gotrakāra ṛṣis*, then any person belonging to this *gotra*, *i. e.* who are descendents of Nāḍāyana will be called Nāḍāyana. Thus it is quite clear that Nāḍāyana derived according to Pāṇini 4.1.99 is not the name of a *gotra* in the *Dharmaśāstra* sense.

Dr. BHANDARKAR shows utter ignorance in grammar while he says that the termination in the Pāṇinian word Nāḍāyana is significative and that the termination means the resting place *i. e.* the place to which Nāḍa or a collection of Nadas go. The termination (*i. e.* the *taddhita* suffix) in the present is *ayana* and not *āyana* as

Dr. BHANDARKAR thinks. It is an established doctrine of grammarians that no suffix (*pratyaya*) has any *laukika* sense: these are not regarded as denotative words (*Vācaka śabdas*) Even if the suffix is accepted as *ayana*, yet it cannot denote the sense of 'resting place.'

It seems that Dr. BHANDARKAR has indiscriminately confused the two different derivations of Nāḍāyana and Nārāyaṇa. Nāḍāyana may be taken as a word ending in the *taddhita* suffix *āyana* (*'phak,'* Pāṇini 4.1.99) or as an example of the *Bahuvrīhi* compound (**नाडाः अयनं यस्य सः**) meaning done 'whose resting place is Nāḍas.' Similarly Nārāyaṇa may be taken as a word ending in the *taddhita* suffix *āyana* meaning 'the *gotra* (in the Pāṇinian sense as shown above) of Nara' (the word Nara has been read in the Naḍādi group of Pāṇini; *vide* 4.1.99); or it may be taken as an example of the *Bahuvrīhi* compound, meaning ' **नाराः अयनं यस्य सः** ' one whose resting place is Nāras. When the words Nāḍāyana and Nārāyaṇa are taken as the *Bahuvrīhi* compounds, there arises no question of termination or suffix (*pratyaya*); the second word *ayana* is a *vācaka śabda* and not a suffix. Thus it is clear that Nārāyaṇa (a masculine word) cannot mean 'the resting place or goal of Nara or a collection of Naras.' In this sense the word would be Nārāyaṇam (**नारस्य अयनम्**) a word of neuter gender.

In conclusion we may inform our readers that in Manu 1.10 (as explained by Medhātithi) Nārāyaṇa (a masculine word) has been taken as an example of the *Bahuvrīhi* compound (**नाराः अयनम् अस्य**) and not as a word ending in the *taddhita* suffix āyana (*phak*).

M. D. PANDIT, Poona

THE SANSKRIT COMPOUNDS

1. Introduction :

Formally speaking, every Sanskrit Compound comprises of minimum two members and can be easily represented by the formula N_1+N_2+S, where N Stands for the nucleus or *prakṛti* and S for the declensional suffix.[1] In the compounds like *putrau*, meaning both the son and the daughter, Pāṇini strictly follows his assumption of the basic structures of compounds to be consisting of *minimum two* members, and in the initial stages, dissolves it as *putraḥ ca duhitā ca*, and then elides the word *duhitā*, *cf. the sūtra*, *bhrātṛputrau svasṛduhitṛbhyām*, 1.2.68.

While reading the chapters on compounds in *Bhoṭṭojī Dikṣita's* (BD) *Siddhānta Kaumudī*: we encounter a small—perhaps the smallest—chapter called *atha sarvasamāsaśeṣaprakaraṇam*. Surprisingly enough, the topics which are discussed in this chapter seem to be out of place in the beginning. Here BD divides the *samāsas* into four main categories : (1) *avyayībhāva* (2) *tatpuruṣa* (3) *bahuvrīhi* and (4) *dvandva*, *cf. samāsaḥ caturvidhaḥ*. The chief characteristics of *samāsas* are listed briefly as respectively *pūrvapadarthapradhāna*, *uttarapadārthapradhāna*, *anyapadārthapradhāna* and *ubhayapadārthapradhāna*. This whole discussion sounds quite relevant upto this stage.

But suddenly BD quotes a small *kārikā*. It runs as follows :

supām supā tiṇā nāmnā dhātunā'tha tiṅām tiṅā, |
subanteneti vijñeyaḥ samāsaḥ ṣaḍvidho budhaiḥ ||

This *kārikā* states that the Sanskrit *samāsas* are in all of *six* main categories. They are (1) *sup+sup* (2) *sup+tiṅ* (3) *sup+nāman* (4) *sup+dhātu* (5) *tiṅ+tiṅ* and lastly (6) *tiṅ+sup*.

Now, one is at a loss to understand these two different statements, *viz*. *samāsaḥ caturvidhaḥ* and *samāsaḥ ṣaḍvidhaḥ*. One also does not know how to reconcile these two statements. The scope of the present paper is to find out a solution to this problem.

2. Samāsa viewed from different points of view :

In order to find out a solution to the discrepancy in the number of types of *samāsas* enumerated by BD, we have no other source but Pāṇini's grammar itself and the two chief commentaries thereon, one of BD and the other of *Kāśikā*.

2. 1. Samāsas as defined by Pāṇini :

If we examine the definition of the *samāsas* given by Pāṇini, we find that all the definitions are based on semantic considerations; *cf.* the basic condition of *sāmarthya* for two *padas* to be compounded; the *sūtra* is *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ*, 2.1.1. The explanation of this *sāmarthya* is given by BD as: *sāmarthyaṁ ca dvividham. Vyapekṣālakṣaṇam ekārthībhāvalakṣaṇaṁ ceti.* In order to further understand these two types of *sāmarthya*, one is compelled to enter into the field of pure semantics (*cf.* Patañjali's discussion on this *sūtra*). The conditions stated in the *sūtras* for *dvandva* (*cf.* *cārthe dvandvaḥ,* 2.2.29), for *bahuvrīhi* (*cf.* *śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ,* 2.2.23, and *anekam anyapadārthe,* 2.2.24), and for *dvigu* (*cf. dviguś ca,* 2.1.23, and *saṁkhyāpūrvo dviguḥ,* 2.1.52) are purely semantic. The *sūtras* for *avyayībhāva* (*cf.* *avyayībhāvaś ca,* 2.1.5 and *avyayam...vacaneṣu,* 2.1.6), and *tatpuruṣa,* (*cf.* *tatpuruṣaḥ,* 2.1.22), which are the *adhikāra-sūtras,* give enumerative type of definitions. The only *samāsa* for which a formal definition is given seems to be *karmadhāraya*; *cf. tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ karmadhārayaḥ* 1.2.42.

This whole attitude raises the fundamental problem as to whether a grammar should be formal or non-formal.[2] Every grammar, to be a real grammar, always takes the formal aspect of language into consideration. It leaves all other non-formal aspect like meaning, number, gender *etc.* out of consideration. The non-formal aspects of language are considered only when they affect the formal description of the language.[3] Pāṇini and Patañjali have clearly emphasised this formal aspect for grammar in the *sūtra, svaṁ rūpaṁ śabdasyāśabdasaṁjñā,* P.1.1.68 and *atha śabdānuśāsanam, Mahābhāṣya* 1, respectively.

But in spite of this strict emphasis on and adherence to the formal aspect, Pāṇini has described many forms, and especially all the *samāsas,* with the help of a reference to their non-formal, or to be exact, semantic purport; *cf.* his *sūtra, samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ,* 2.1.1. which takes nothing but semantic conditions into consideration, *cf.* also BD's commentary on the *sūtras, śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ,* 2.2.23, and *anekam anyapadārthe,* 2.2.24 : *anekam anyasya padasya arthe vartamānam vā samasyate sa bahuvrīhiḥ.* There are many such examples scattered in the *samāsa* chapters where the formal aspect is explained with a reference to semantic consideration. This adherence to meaning for the description of language goes contrary to the original emphasis on 'formality' by Pāṇini.

This approach of Pāṇini to the description of compounds with the help of semantic import has further given rise to the semantic problem of *pradhānatva* or *apradhānatva* (*i. e.* predominance, or its absence which is of course semantic and hence subjective) of the first or second member of the compound. And the *samāsas* thus semantically described by Pāṇini are divided into four different categories on the basis of whether the first, or the second or both or none of the members are *pradhāna* in the

compound. And we have the compounds divided on this basis into four types as (1) *pūrvapadārtha-pradhāna* (the first member being semantically predominant) which is *avyayībhāva*, (2) *uttarapadārtha-pradhāna* (the second or latter member being predominant) which is *tatpuruṣa*, (3) *anyapadārthapradhāna* (a member which is entirely from outside the members of the compound being semantically predominant) which is *bahuvrīhi*, and finally (4) *ubhayapadārthapradhāna* (both the members being semantically equally predominant) which is *dvandva*; *cf.* BD and *Kāśikā* on the Pāṇinian ***sūtras*** defining the compounds. Since obviously there is no fifth possibility of the predominance of the members, we have only four categories of compounds. It is these four main categories which BD refers to in the small chapter in his *Siddānta-Kaumudī*.

2. 2. Samāsa viewed formally :

If, neglecting Pāṇini totally, on the other hand, we examine the constituent members of the Sanskrit compounds from formal point of view, we find that all the members of a *samāsa* can be grouped under the following main categories. Any member or word in a compound can be either a *subanta* or *tiṅanta* or a *nāman* which refers, according to BD, to a *kṛdanta*, or a *dhātu*, which according to BD refers to the root-nouns like *prū etc.* formed with a zero, *kṛt*-suffix. Since any two of these four categories can be compounded with one another, we get the following *six* combinations according to BD : i) *subanta+subanta*, (2) *subanta+tiṅanta*, (3) *subanta+nāman*, (4) *subanta+dhātu*, (5) *tiṅanta+tiṅanta*, and (6) *tiṅanta+subanta*. It is these six formal categories which BD mentions in his *kārikā* quoted above.

These four categories theoretically can however, give us the following twenty combinations of two categories each :

A) 1*a*, *sup+sup* (*e. g. rāja-puruṣaḥ*) and its opposite *i. e. sup+sup*, 1*b*.
2*a*, sup+*tiṅ* (*e. g. pary-abhūṣat*) and its opposite *i. e. tiṅ+sup*, 2*b*
3*a*, *sup+nāman* (*e.g. kumbha-kāraḥ*) and its opposite *i. e. nāman+sup*, 3*b*
4*a*, *sup+dhātu* (*e.g. kaṭa-prūḥ*) and its opposite *i.e. dhātu+sup*, 4*b*

B) 5*a*, *tiṅ+tiṅ* (*e.g. khādata-modata*) and its opposite *i.e. tiṅ+tiṅ*, 5*b*
6*a*, *tiṅ+nāman* (*e.g. Khādata-kāraḥ*) and its opposite *i.e. nāman+tiṅ*, 6*b*
7*a*, *tiṅ+dhātu* (*e.g. khādata-prūḥ*) and its opposite, *i.e. dhātu+tiṅ*, 7*b*

C) 8*a*, *nāman+nāman* (*e.g. bhāra-hāraḥ*) and its opposite *i.e. nāman+nāman*, 8*b*
9*a*, *nāman+dhātu* (*e.g. bhāra-vāḥ*) and its opposite *i.e. dhātu+nāman*, 9*b*

D) 10*a*, *dhātu+dhātu* (*e.e. kṛt-prūḥ*) and its opposite, *dhātu+dhātu*, 10*b*

Out of these combinations, the combinations nos. 6*a*-6*b*, 7*a*-7*b*, 10*a*-10*b*, 3*b*, 4*b* 9*b* are impossible combinations not allowed by Sanskrit Language and grammar. By deducting these nine combinations the number comes down to (20-9=)11. The combinations nos. 1*b*, 5*b* and 8*b* are identical with their respective opposites, *viz*. 1*a*, 5*a* and 8*a*. Reducing, therefore, the total number by 3, we get (11-3=)8 as the remaining combinations. Out of these 8, again, the combinations 1*a*, 8*a* and 9*a* can be treated under only one heading, *viz*. *sup*+*sup*: hence, keeping only combination no. 1a as representative of 8*a* and 9*a*, and deducing the two, *viz*. 8*a* and 9*a*, the total number of usable combinations in Sanskrit remains to be (8-2=)6, *viz*. 1*a*, 2*a*, 2*b*, 3*a*, 4*a* and 5*a* which only are allowed by Sanskrit language and grammar. This exactly is the number noted by BD in his chapter. For the 2*b* type, the example given is *kṛnta-vicakṣaṇa*.

3. Solution :

We, therefore, see that the basis of the four-fold division of Sanskrit compounds into *avyayībhāva*, *tatpuruṣa*, *bahuvrīhi* and *dvandva* is purely semantic while the six-fold division given by BD is done on the basis of a reference to the formal categories of *pratyayas* or suffixes attached to the *prātipadikas* or *dhātus*; the suffixes may be from *sup* or *tin* or from *kṛt*; *cf*. the term *dhātu* referring to the root-noun form *prū* in *kaṭa-prūḥ*, which retains its original *dhātu*-form even after the addition of the zero *kṛt*-suffix *kvip* according to the *sūtra*, *kvip ca*, 3.2.76; the term *nāman*, borrowed from the older text of Yāska, *viz*. *Nirukta*, refers to any *prātipadika* formed by the addition of *kṛt*-suffixes except the zero-suffixes like *kvip*, *ṇvi*, *viṭ etc*. And at this stage one need not be confused as to the discrepancy in the number of categories of the compounds, because the categories are made on different foundations. The discrepancy is bound to be there and is quite natural That speaks for an all-sided view of compounds taken by the Sanskrit grammarians. It is also to be noted that the formal basis of division seems to be pre-Pāṇinian, when the terms *nāman* and *dhātu* were used for the verbal formations in non-zero and zero suffxies.

4. A Word about the names of the compounds :

There are, as is well-known, four main compounds in Sanskrit, *viz*. *avyayībhāva*, *tat-puruṣa*, *dvandva* and *bahuvrīhi*. Though these names are taken to be technical terms, they are not purely technical like *ghu*, *ghi*, *bha etc*. nor are they fully meaningful. A possible explanation of these terms, it is felt, might prove interesting to the students of grammar,[4] and may not be out of place here.

4. 1. avyayībhava :

As the term indicates, it contains an *avyaya* (='no-modification') *i. e*. indeclinable, which does not undergo any modification before or after the application of either *sup* or *tin* or *kṛt* or *tadddhita* suffixes. The compound also must contain an *avyaya*. The term *avyayībhāva* is fully meaningful.

4. 2. **tat-puruṣa** :

This is a very strange term used by Pāṇini. None of the two members, *viz. tat* and *puruṣa* has anything to do with any of the members of a *tat-puruṣa* compound like *paṇḍita-putraḥ* or *vyāghra-bhīti etc.* Where does such a strange term come from ?

Let us concentrate on the term itself. As is clear, it contains two constituent members, *tat* and *puruṣa*. Now the term itself is a perfect compound according to strict criteria of Sanskrit grammar. If we try to dissolve this compound, it can be dissolved in any of the following seven ways. In other words, it can have any of the following as *alaukika vigraha vākya* :

1. *saḥ puruṣaḥ* (= that man)
2. *taṁ puruṣaṁ* (= to that man)
3. *tena puruṣeṇa* (by that man)
4. *tasmai puruṣāya* (= for that man)
5. *tasmāt puruṣāt* (= from that man)
6. *tasya puruṣasya* (= of that man)
7. *tasmin puruṣe* (=on that man)

Now compare the dissolution or *alaukika vigraha vākya* of any other *tat-puruṣa* compound used in Sanskrit and we find that the dissolution of the usable compound fits in or strictly follows any of the seven possible dissolutions of the compound *tat-puruṣa* given above. Naturally, the logic behind giving the name '*tat-puruṣa*' to all the *tat-puruṣa* compounds seems to be to name all those compounds as '*tatpuruṣa*', whose dissolution follows or is after the pattern of the compound and the technical term '*tat-puruṣa*'. The compound called *upapada tatpuruṣa* is a variety of *tatpuruṣa* dissolved in the same way.

4. 3. **dvandva** :

The explanation of this term is very easy. The word *dvandva* means 'a group of two' or 'a couple'. Now, therefore, the compound of all such members which are combined together with the meaning of 'and' (*ca*) and form 'a group of two or three or any number' can be termed as *dvandva.* This term, like the term '*avyayībhāva*' is thus self-explanatory.

4. 4. **bahuvrīhi** :

The logic which is applied in the case of the term *tat-puruṣa* above can be extended to the present term *bahu-vrīhiḥ* also. The meaning of the word '*bahu-vrīhiḥ*' is 'the person who has plenty of rice' ; the *alaukika vigraha vākya* or the dissolution is '*bahavaḥ vrīhavaḥ yasya*'. All the compounds, therefore, which have the dissolution after the fashion of the word '*bahuvrīhi*' are termed as *bahuvrīhi* compounds.

4. 5. dvigu :

As the definition of this term states (*cf. saṁkhyā-pūrvo dviguḥ*, 2. 1. 52), the compound having any number-word in it, as in the word *dvi-gu* itself, is termed as *dvigu*. The word *dvi* in *dvigu* represents the number-word. The term is thus self-explanatory.

4. 6. karma-dhāraya :

The technical term *karmadhāraya* is defined in the *sūtra*, *tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ karmadhārayaḥ*, 1. 2. 42, and defines the compound as a sub-division of the *tat-puruṣa*. Actually, if we try to dissolve the compound-word *karma-dhāraya*, the likely dissolution is '*karma dhārayati saḥ*' or *karmaṇo dhārayaḥ* (=*dhārakaḥ*). The first dissolution is after the fashion of the *upapada tat-puruṣa*. If we take a concrete example of a regular *karmadhāraya* compound from the language, like *kṛṣṇa-mṛgaḥ*, its dissolution as *Kṛṣṇaḥ mṛgaḥ* does not tally with either of the two patterns of dissolution of the word *karmadhāraya*. So the reasoning applied in the case of *tat-puruṣa* and *bahuvrīhi* does not hold good here. We do not know where the technical term *karma-dhāraya* is borrowed from, nor do we know its significance and properety in applying to examples like *kṛṣṇa-mṛgaḥ*.

7. We have in all the following seven types of compounds on semantic basis :

1. *avyayībhāva*, 2. *tat-puruṣa*, 3. *upapada tat-puruṣa*, 4. *karma-dhāraya*, 5. *dvandva*, 6. *dvigu* and lastly, 7. *bahuvrīhi*. A verse in sanskrit, which is traditionally handed down as an example of humour, lists all these compounds. It is as follows :

dvandvo dvigur api cāham
mad-gehe nityam avyayībhāvaḥ |
tat-puruṣa karma dhāraya
yenahaṁ syāṁ bahuvrīhiḥ ||

NOTES

1. For a detailed symbolic representation of Sanskrit compounds, *cf.* M. D. Pandit, "Pāṇini – A study in Non-Compounded Word – Structures," *VIJ*, 1963, Vol.I Part II, pp.1-15 and "*Pāṇini* – A study in Compound word-structures," *JMSUB*, 1962, Humanities Section, pp. 81-101.
2. *cf.* C. F. Hockett, *A Course in Modern Linguistics*, 1964. 131-137; also pp. 147-261.
3. *cf.* M. D. Pandit, 'Formal and Non-Formal in Pāṇini,' *ABORI*, 1973. pp. 179-192.
4. K. C. Chatterjee has discussed many of the technical terms of Sanskrit grammar; *cf.* K. C. Chatterjee, *Technical Terms in Sanskrit Grammar*.

Radhamadhab DASH, Bhubaneswar :

SOME PRINCIPLES IN FIXING UP PĀṆINI'S AUTHORSHIP OF EXAMPLES FROM THE EXAMPLES SUPPLIED IN THE KĀŚIKĀ-VṚTTIḤ

Introduction :

In carrying on a systematic study of the examples (exs) found in the *Kāśikā-Vṛtti* (*KV*) of Jayāditya and Vāmana (J & V), 7th Cent. *A. D.*, considerable importance should be attached to the aspect of fixing the actual number of exs supplied by its authors because many of its exs are seen borrowed from other grammatical sources both Pāṇinian and non-pāṇinian preceding to it. If one looks to the history of grammatical tradition of Sanskrit language in India, it is marked that J & V succeed four grammarians in Pāṇinian school : Pāṇini (P), 450 B. C., the sūtrakāra, Kātyāyana (kty), 350 B.C., the Vārttikakāra, Patañjali (ptj), 150 B.C., the Mahābhāṣyakāra, and Bhartṛhari, 150 A. D., the author of the book *Vākyapadīya* a treatise on philosophy of grammar and Mahābhāṣyadīpikā, a commentary on Mahābhāṣya (*M*); two grammarians of non-pāṇinian school, Śarvavarmā, 5th Cent. *A.D.*, expounder of the *Kātantra* school of grammar, candragomin, 6th Cent. *A. D.*, the founder of *Cāndra* school of grammar. The scholars[1] have tried to show some examples illustrativelly from *Kātantra* and *Cāndra Vyākaraṇa* (*CV*)[2] which are incorporated in *KV* by its authors. Not only the *Kātantra* and *CV*, all the sources[3] before them mainly the *M* & *CV* have been utilized by its authors to the maximum extent. The extensive incorporation of the exs by *KV*'s authors is seen alongwith the grammatical theories, opinions and conclusions. In some cases of borrowals of the examples, *KV*'s authors have effected modification also. Excluding all these, new ones are seen given by these authors where either correspondence of the context is lacking or the *sūtra* is not taken up for being commented as in the case of *M*. A grammarian is free to pick up any word of his choice from the usage and set it as an ex on a *sūtra* to show the working of that *sūtra*. It is also true with *KV*'s authors, who are supposed to have given some exs freely not borrowing from any other grammatical sources. Thus it is worth the effort to fix up such examples of J & V.

2. Elimination : The Basis of Assertion :

One should eliminate the citations from Vedic literature and the exs considered to be of P, Kty, Ptj, Śarvavarmā, and candragomin from the totality of exs of *KV*. Then

the rest of the exs may be said to have been given by the authors J & V. Thus the fixing up of the exs of J & V presupposes the fixing of the other sources cited above and Pāṇinian exs as its first step in that light.

2.1. Examples Considered Pāṇinian :

Examples to be considered fully of Pāṇinian nature may be grouped under three heads : P-expressed (Expr) P-indicated (Ind) P-implied (Imp). In doing so Pāṇini's text of the *sūtrapāṭha*[4] is accepted as the basis which constitutes the literature of P.

2.1.1. P in some *sūtras* has *expressed* some exs. These are mostly of irregular nature. The words which he has failed to explain conclusively by applying the rules of his grammar are propounded as such. These are P-Exp-exs. The instances of this kind of sūtras are : *upeyivān anāśvān anucānaś*ca : 3.2.109 in the context of *KvasU* suffix; *pāṇighatāḍaghau śilpini* : 3. 2. 55 (in the context of *TaK* suffix); *vācaṁyamapuranda-rau ca* : 6.3.69 (in the context of insertion of *mUM*) &c.

2.1.2. P indicates the derivation of certain words by some *sūtras* where both the formantic and semantic elements are stated in the same *sūtra*. These *sūtras* by them-selves are sufficient enough to generate intended expressions. Or in otherwords neither of the formantic and semantic elements is required to be supplied from the preceding *sūtra* to the *sūtra* under discussion for the analysis of such exs. Thus these exs are termed as P-Ind ones. Some such *sūtras* are *vrajayajor bhāve KyaP* : 3.3.68, *āḍhya subhaga-sthūla-palita-nagnāndha priyeṣu cvyarteṣu acvau kṛñḥ karaṇe KHYUN*: 3. 2. 56, *tadasya sañjātaṁ tārakādibhya itaC* : 5.2.36 &c. In the first *sūtra* cited, formantic elements are the roots *vraj* and *yaj* and suffix *KyaP*, and the semantic element is *bhāve*, 'in the stative sense.' Similarly in the next two *sūtras*, the presence of both the forman-tic and semantic elements *indicate* the derivation of the words which are given as exs in *KV*. Thus the exs *vrajyā* and *yajyā* on 3.3.68 *āḍhyaṁkaraṇam, subhagaṁkaraṇam* &c on 3.2.56 are the P-Ind exs.

2.1.3. Certain exs found in the *KV* are implied to be Pāṇinian if a given *sūtra* is not suffieient by itself to generate certain expression, i. e. some deficiency either of formantic or semantic element is found in a given *sūtra*. And the deficiency is made good by supplying it from the preceding sūtra by *anuvṛtti* 'chain tecnique.' The gover-nance of certain element is also understood from the context by the same procedure of *anuvṛtti* from the preceding *adhikāra sūtra* or section-heading rule. The context of certain *adhikāra*, continues till it meets with another incompatible element. Also the limitation of the *anuvṛtti* is known from the tradition preserved by *Vt-kāra, M-kāra Vṛttikāra*.

2.1.3.0. This implication of course varies in degree and as such be termed as exclusive implication (Imp excl) and simple implication (Imp smp) basing on the degree of probability of the implication.

2.1.3.1. An ex in *KV* is considered exclusively implied to be Pāṇinian if it is given on a *sūtra* which is not self-sufficient for the complete analysis of the ex under discussion but depends upon the preceding *sūtra* (s) for supplying with the deficient element either formantic or semantic for its complete analysis. *Gāthaka* is the ex supplied on 3.1.146 : *gas thakan*. In this *sūtra*, the intended semantic condition *śilpini* not presented is to be supplied from 3.1.145 : *śilpini ṢVUN* or in other words the word *gāthaka* can be derived from the verbal root *gai* with the suffix *thakaN* when 'artisan' is meant. Thus this word given as ex is imp-exclusively from the *sūtra*, *i. e.* P-Imp excls. Similarly on *stambakarṇayoḥ ramijapoḥ* : 3.1.13, *KV* supplies *stamberamaḥ and karṇejapaḥ* in the sense of *tācchīlya* 'constant habit' understood from 3.1.11. Thus these examples doubtlessly be said as actually intended by P which for our purpose kept under the category of P-Imp excls. The majority of the exs to be considered pāṇinian from the *sūtra* text come under this category.

2.1.3.2a. Some of pāṇinian exs are of the nature of simple implication. As the text of P-*sūtras* has been solely relied upon here to fix up the Pāṇinian examples out of the enormity of exs supplied in *KV*, very simple exs which *KV's* authors present, are to be considered Pāṇinian by applying one's common sense (CS). Let us discuss some such exs. Under 3.4.2 : *Kriyāsamabhihāre loṭ loṭohisvau vā ca tadhvamoḥ*, *KV* gives the exs *imau lunītaḥ, ime lunanti, yuvām lunīthaḥ, yūyam lunītha*. These are given in the sentence-form. P has used this root *lū* vide 3.2.154 : *Prusṛlva samabhihāre VUN*, and these exs are to be implied pāṇinian *i.e.* known to P for the simple reason that they are all simple and one's CS will lead one to form such conclusion.

Similarly under 3.3.160 : *icchārthebhyo vibhāṣā vartamāne* (*LIN*), *KV* supplies the exs *icchati icchet, vaṣṭi uṣyāt, kāmayate kāmayeta* all of which constitute very simple form and one would be tempted to say them pāṇinian exs applying one's CS. Thus P implied exs are those simple exs which are supported by CS. One cannot deny that they are not known to P.

2.1.3.2b. Many counter examples (C-exs) mostly consisting simple form can also be included under this category for the reason quoted above. One instance may be given here. Under 3.4.4, the C-exs are *chinnati* and *paṭhati* which are of very simple form and P himself has used the roots *chid* and *paṭh* in 3.2.61 and 3.3.64 respectively.

2.1.3.2c. Some C-exs given below are to be treated as intended by P, *i.e*. of the nature of P Imp smp. No other alternative can possibly replace them, and also one's CS will impel for their inclusion under this category. Under 3.4.10 : *prayai rohiṣyai avyathiṣyai* (*tumunarthe chandasi*), the corresponding classical forms would, be only with

the infinitive ending '*tumUN*' which is expected in connection with *bhāṣā*, 'in the colloquial tongue.' The intended C-exs are thus given by *KV's* authors as *prayātum*, *rohaṇāya* and *avyathanāya* where the last two are with dative ending in the sense of infinitive suffix *tumUN* which P sanctions by 2.3.15 : *tumarthācca bhāvavacanāt* (*caturthī*). Similarly the C-exs *draṣṭum* and *vikhyātum* in the 3.4.11 : *dṛśevikhye ca* (*tumarthe chandasi*) are unique and possibly would have been thought as counterparts in classical language. As such they are to be treated as pāṇinian implied by applying one's CS.

3 0. Some doubtful cases :

What is told above is a fairly general way of fixing up P's exs from the enoromous exs presented in *KV*. But there are a number of specific problems. Let us take up *some* and the most probable solution be taken. There, no attempt is made to see the attestation in the contemporary literature of the exs under question rather P's text of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is fully relied[5] upon and is assumed as first-hand document to study P's mind.

3.1. In the context of conjugation in middle voice (*ātmanepada vidhāna*) 1.3.15 : *na gatihiṁsārthebhyaḥ* prohibits the middle voice suffix after the verbs having the sense of 'motion' or 'injury' provided the 'interchange of action' is expressed which (middle voice sufix) otherwise would have been due by the preceding *sūtra* 1.3.14 : *kartari karmavyatīhāre*. Here *KV* supplies the exs *vyatigacchanti* and *vyatisarpanti* as instances of motion-denoting roots. One by one's CS can say that the first one might be preferably intended by p with prefixes *vi* and *ati* for both the suffixes in that order can have the sense of 'interchange of action,' which is however latent in the word '*vyatīhāra*.' The root '*gam*' is the simple and usual one denoting movement. The plural ending in present tense here has the same significance as would have been with the singular. Thus supplying '*Vyatigacchanti*' as an ex here seems befitting to the context. The other one *vyatisarpanti* can hardly be compared with *vyatigacchanti* so far as the frequency of its occurance in the language is concerned. P himself is seen mentioning both the movement-denoting roots *gam* and *sṛp*. When the latter is seen[6] thrice only in 3.4.17, 7.4.65 and 8.3.110, the former quite a number of times which convinces us to accept the ex '*vyatigacchanti*' as simply implied by P by applying our CS. The second one may be implied but it is not as common as the first one. Thus the probability of occurance with less frequency prompts us to entertain doubt regarding its pāṇinian nature.

3.2. Some C-exs may be said to have been exclusively P-implied. On 1.3.20 : *āno do'nāsyaviharaṇe* in the context of conjugation in middle voice, *KV* supplies *vidyām ādatte*. Here the whole sentence-ex cannot be implied from the text of P. The *sūtra* only intends the verbal form *ādatte* but the C-exs *āsyam vyādadāti*, supplied in *KV* on this *sūtra* rather be said definitely implied from P's *sūtra* or of P-Imp excls.

3.3. On 1.3.32 : *gandhanāvakṣepaṇa sevana sāhasikya pratiyatna prakathana prayogeṣu kṛñḥ*, *KV* supplies exs *utkurute* and *udākurute* in the sense of *sevana*, *prakurute* in the sense of *sāhasikya*. These exs with various prefixes are not implied from the *sūtra* text of P. Had these prefixes been meant here, P would have made their entry in the *sūtra* as he has done with 1.3.30 : *ni samupavibhyo hvaḥ* (*ātmanepadam*), 1.3.31 : *spardhāyām āṅḥ* (*hvaḥ ātmanepadam*) &c. If in the exs under discussion the prefixes are said to be presenting the respective senses *gandhana etc.*, and *KV*'s authors have rightly understood the mind of P, then it is not comprehended why he has not conditioned the root *Kṛ* with these prefixes as he is found doing with other *sūtras*. This may be an instance of stylistic variation of P if considered in the light of *KV*'s exs cited above or no prefixes would have been required for the root *Kṛ* to connote all these senses as P has not provided for any prefixes ?

3.4. P is seen generalising some grammatical operation in connection with the term *upasarga*. The instances are in 3.3.22, 59, 61 &c. On the *sūtra* 3.3.22 *upasarge ruvaḥ* (*GHaN*), *KV* gives exs *Saṁrāvaḥ* and *uparāvaḥ*. These exs be said to be definitely Pāṇinian, *i. e.* P implied exclusively. The generalisation of the prefixes may result in the derivation of as many forms as there are twenty different *upasargas*.[7] Thus this rule theoretically does not debar the exs *prarāvaḥ parārāvaḥ* and others though they are not given here in *KV*. Nor does P, in subsequent *sūtras* delimit the scope of this *sutra* by prohibiting any *upasargas* to occur in contiguity with the root *ru* when the suffix *GHaN* is attached. It may be compared with the similar *sūtra*, 3.3.106; *ātaścopasarge* where such generalisation is seen and *KV* supplies the exs with the prefixes *pra* and *upa* : *pradā*, *upadā*, *pradhā* and *upadhā*. Therefore the exs *saṁrāvaḥ* and *uparāvaḥ* given in the *KV* with the prefixes *sam* and *upa* be pāṇinian exs due to his generalized condition '*upasarge*.' This is corroborated by the text of P where he specifies certain *upasagaras* and excludes other undesired *upasargas* as is the case with 3.3.28 : *nirabhyo pulvoḥ* (*GHaN*). Here P intends only two forms of each of the roots *pū* and *lū* with prefixes *nir* and *abhi*.

Thus specification of '*upasargas*' in some cases, generalisation in others displays P's close observation of the forms. The case of non-attestation of these exs resulted due to this generalization '*upasarge*' (if at all happens) may be explained as the deficiency with us due to ours inheriting only fragments[8] of the contempórary or pre-pāṇinian literature and also to think of attestation of each word found in p's *bhāṣā* seems impossible[9].

Joshi[10] estimates P's grammar in term of generative grammar, the role of which is only to generate expression without taking into account their actual usage. When the Indian grammatical tradition upholds P a *lakṣaikacakṣu*, 'a philogogist, whose eyes have been solely fixed on the actual usage', Joshi's estimation reduces the high status of an Observationist into a theoriest, a pragmatist into a conservate, which is not generally acceptable.

4. **Examples occuring in pairs & clusters : a principle :**

KV often supplies the exs very simple in forms and one would be tempted to say these pāṇinian by applying one's CS. *Pacati* and *paṭhati* are seen as exs on 8.4.66. Even though both the verbal forms are supposed to have been known to P, the simultaneous occurance of the two in the same order is noticed in *M* II.9.18 on 3.1.3.11 which would make us believe that as exs *KV*'s authors have borrowed them from *M*. For the similar reason *Vṛkṣaḥ, plakṣaḥ* found in the same order in *M* I. 257.7 on 1.3.1.7 be treated as a case of borrowal from *M* though *vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ* as separate words are seen occuring in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* vide 2.4.12, and 2.8·55 respectively.

Here below, a concordance of the pairs or clusters of exs consisting of simple forms are presented which are also found as such in *M*. And it is sufficient to make us believe that *KV's* authos have simply borrowed them from *M*. For the reason cited above, however simple may be in their forms, they are not to be treated pāṇinian rather the cases of borrowals from *M*.

Sl. No.	Name of pairs/ clusters, nominal/ verbal base.	Found with different nominal/conjugational endings.	References in *KV*[11]	References in *M*[12]
1.	*Vṛkṣa & plakṣa*	*vṛkṣaḥ, plakṣaḥ*	on 8.4.68,	I.257.7 on 1.3.1.7
		vṛkṣastarati, plakṣastarati	on 8.3.18,	I.29.22
		vṛkṣaiḥ, plakṣaiḥ	on 1.1.70	III.179.23 on 6.4.18
		vṛkṣāya, plakṣāya	on 1.1.56,	I.135.19,20 on 1.1.56.8
		vṛkṣāt, plakṣāt	on 1.3.4,	III.245.15 on 7.1.12
		vṛkṣāṇām plakṣāṇām	on 7.1.54	I.80.12-13 on 6.1.102
2.	*vana, dhana, ahan, kāṇḍa, kuḍī*	*vanam, dhanam, ahan, kāṇḍe, kuḍye*	on 1.2.45,	I.217.1,4,8 on the same *sūtra*
3.	*gomat & yavamat*	*gomān, yavamān*	on 8.2.23,	I.161.19-20 on 1.1.62.1
4.	*khaṭvā & mālā*	*khaṭvābhiḥ, mālābhiḥ*	on 8.2.23,	III.64.22 on 6.1.85.25
5.	*vāc & tvac*	*vākṣu, tvakṣu*	on 1.1.5,	I.167.21 on 1.1.63.6
6.	*mātṛ & pitṛ*	*mātuḥ, pituḥ*	on 8.2.24,	III.403.16 on 8.2.25.3
7.	*Devadatta & Yajñadatta*	*Devadattaḥ, Yajñadattaḥ*	on 1.2.58,	I.230.6-7 on *vt*.5 on the same *sūtra*
		(in the sentence-exs : *ahaṁ Devadatto brabīmi, ahaṁ yajñadatto brabīmi.*)		
8.		*kartavyam, ābhyām*	on 1.1.21,	I.78.5 on *vt*. 7 & I.79.6 on *vt*. 14 on the same *sūtra*.

Sl. No.	Name of pairs/ clusters, nominal/ verbal base.	Found with different nominal/conjugational endings.	References in *KV*[11]	References in *M*[12]
9.	*gir, dhur*	*gīrṣu, dhūrṣu*	on 8.3.57,	III. 426.22, on 8.3.16
10.	*agni, & vāyu*	*agnīnām, vayūnām*	on 7.1.54,	III.109.3 on 6.1.177.
		agnī iti, vāyū iti	on 8.4.57,	III.63.10 on 6.1.85.17
11.	*agnimat & vāyumat*	*agnimān, vāyumān*	on 8.2.9,	I.99.14 on 1.1.39.15
12.	*dyau, pathin, & tad*	*dyauḥ, panthāḥ, saḥ*	on 1.2.28,	I.206.3 on this *sūtra*
13.	*grāmaṇī, senānī*	*gramanīḥ, senānīḥ*	on 1.2.47,	I.158.23 on 1.1.60.4
14.	*agnicit & somasut*	*agnicīṣt, somasūṣt*	on 1.2.28,	III.393.7 on 8.2.6.11
15.	*bhū & śri*	*bhuvaḥ, śriyaḥ*	on 1.1.72,	III.73.3 on 6.1.91.9
16.	*kartṛ & hartṛ*	*kartṛ, hartṛ*	on 8.4.57,	I.34.16 on *Śiva sūtra*
		kartā, hartā	on 8.2.42,	I.126.25 on 1.1.51.4
17.	*kāraṇā & hāraṇā*	*kāraṇā, hāraṇā*	on 3.3.107,	I.197.3 on 1.2.9.2
18.	*kāraka & hāraka*	*kārakaḥ, hārakaḥ*	on I.2.46,	I.121.7 on 1.1.50.2
19.	*cikīrṣaka & jihīrṣaka*	*cikīrṣakaḥ, jihīrṣakaḥ*	on 1.1.58,	I.152.18 on the same *sūtra.*
20.	*kṛti & hṛti*	*kṛtiḥ, hṛtiḥ*	on 3.3.110,	I.125.22 on 1.1.51
21.	*roots kṛ & hṛ*	*kariṣyati, hariṣyati*	on 7.2.38,	III.440.5-6 on 8.3.59.4
		cikīrṣati, jihīrṣati	on 7.2.42,	III.365.2 on 8.1.4
		akārṣīt, ahārṣīt	on 8.2.28,	III.208.10 on 6.4.76
		kāryate, hāryate	on 1.1.63,	III.200.22 on 6.4.48
22.	roots *pac & paṭh*	*pacati, paṭhati*	on 8.4.66,	II.9.18 on 3.1.3.11
		papāca, papāṭha	on 7.4.70,	I.77.3 on 1.1.21.3
23.	roots *pac & yaj*	*pipakṣati, yiyakṣati,*	on 7.4.79,	III.71.16 on 6.1.91.4
24.	roots *ci & su*	*acinavam, asunavam*	on 1.1.5,	I.55.10 on *vt.* 4 on the same *sūtra,*
25.	roots *lū & pū*	*lunīte, punīte*	on 6.4.113,	I.292.25 on 1.3.72
		alāvīt, apāvīt	on 8.2.3,	I.49.7 on 1.1.3.10
26.	roots *rud & svap*	*rudihi, svapihi*	on *hal sūtra.*	I.27.16, on *vt.* 3 on *śiva sūtra*-5

These instances no more claim to be exhaustive. And there would still many more to be met with while one sorts out the exs of *KV* basing on the principles laid down. In most of the cases of concordance there is no *sūtra* correspondence, *i. e.* examples are not always found in both *M* & *KV* on the same *sūtras*, still *KV* extensively

corroborates the text, conclusions and exs from *M*, when similar or allied contexts occur. *KV*'s authors cautiously borrow exs from *M*, which appear to them the befitting ones.

To conclude that the simplicity of such exs and one's CS do not always guide us for fixing up P's exs and those found in pairs and clusters in *KV* are sometimes really borrowed from *M*. One is susceptible to meet with manifold problems in fixing up P's exs from the exs of *KV*, the instances which are discussed constitute a fraction only.

NOTES

1. (a) 1886, F. Kielhorn, "The cāndra Vyākaraṇa and the Kāśikā-Vṛtti", *IA*, 15: 183-85.
   (b) 1970, M. D. Sharma, "Kāśikāyāṁ Pāṇinīyetara Vyākaraṇānāṁ prabhāvaḥ", *Sāgarikā*, 8 : 3, 1-21
   (c) 1977, Raghuvir Vedalankara, *Kāśikākā Samālocanātmak Adhyayana*, Delhi, Chap. 8, 241-75
   (d) 1981, P. Visalakshy, "The Influence of Cāndra and Kātantra Grammars on Kāśikā Vṛtti", *Vishvesvarananda Indological journal*, 19 : 1-ii, 44-49

2. By the *CV*, I mean both the *sūtras* and *vṛtti* on them. Grammarian Candragomin is accepted mostly as the author of both the *sūtras* and *Vṛtti*. See George Cardona, ***Pāṇini, a survey of Research*** (Delhi : 1980) p. 155; also the note 49, p.320.

3. Vide Introductory verse 1 :

   Vṛttau bhāṣye tathā dhātunāmapārāyaṇādiṣu |
   Viprakīrṇasya tantrasya kriyate sārasaṁgrahaḥ ||

   See *kāśikā* critically edited by A. Sharma and K. R. Deshpande, sanskrit pariṣat, Osmania University, 1969. But *KV*'s authors have no where acknowledged the borrowal from *CV* or '*Vṛttau*' above may be said to include also the *Cāndra Vṛtti*.

4. Kielhorn's suggestions for the original text of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as known to Ptj have been accepted here for the purpose. See his paper "Notes on the Mahābhāṣya; 6. the text of Pāṇini's sūtras, as given in the kāśikā vṛtti, compared with the text as known to kātyāyana and Patañjali," *IA* 16 (1887) 178-84. subsequently many scholars have discussed from time to time about the probable interpolations or dual authorship. See G. Cardona, *Op. Cit.*, 165-55. Also see S. D. Joshi & J. A. F. Roodbergen "The structure of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in Historical Perspective", *Proceeding of the International Seminar on Pāṇini* (CASS, Poona : 1973) ·59-95. Till the coming out

of a new critical edn. of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of P in the light of the suggestions of Pāṇinian scholars above, the *sūtrapāṭha* known to Ptj suggested by kielhorn be accepted as the standard *sūtrapāṭha.*

5. This reliance is due to accepting the present *sūtrapāṭha* given in *KV* exlcuding the instances traced by KIELHORN, (see note 4).

6. The mention of root *gam*/ its verbal forms seen in the *sūtras* : 1.2.13 ; 3.2.47, 67, 171 ; 3.58 ; 4.3.85 ; 5.1.74 , 6.4.16, 40,98; 7.2.58, 68 ; 3.77.

7. Corresponding to *prādayaḥ* in the *Gaṇapāṭha* considered to be Pāṇinian, we find all the *upasargas* in Yāska's *Niruktam*, a pre-pāṇinian treatise though it does not conform to the pāṇinian order. It starts with *ān* but not with *pra*.
See *Niruktam* with com. of Durgācārya, and notes by pt. Shivadatta SHARMA, (Bombay, saṁvat 1982) pp. 27-29 which supports my hypothesis that P would know all the *upasargas* and would intend the twenty forms.

8. See S. D. LADDU, *Evolution of Sanskrit Language from Pāṇini to Patañjali*, (CASS : 1974) pp. 20-22. also G. BUHLER "The roots of the dhātupāṭha not found in literature, 1894 ; rpt. in J. F. STALL (Ed.) *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarian* (Massachusetts : 1972) p. 201.

9. *Cf.* "In the forlong lectures for 1829 Jules BLOCH (BSUS 5:71) remarks : 'In India conditions are vastly different, our knowledge of its language of which we know neither the local basis, nor the degree of connection with the vernaculars......the majority are mainly adopted for purely literary usage" vide S. M. KATRE, *some problems of Historical Linguistics in Indo Aryan*. (Poona : 1965) p. 23.

10. See S. D. JOSHI ed. intro. and eng trans. of *M, samarthāhnika* (University of Poona : 1968) Intro. ix "The generative grammar builds units of a more complex structure by strictly applying the rules which make up the system. It does not matter whether the generated forms are actually used in spoken or written language. The generative grammar concernes only with correct usage".

11. See n. 3 for reference.

12. F. KIELHORN (Ed.). *The* Vyākaraṇa *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, Vol. I, ***BORI***, 3rd edn. 1962; Vol. II, *BORI*, 3rd edn. 1965; Vol. III, *BORI*, 3rd edn. 1972.

K. V. Sarma, Madras :

SCIENTIFIC TEXTS IN SANSKRIT IN AID OF MODERN SCIENCE

I. Introductory :

An aspect of Sanskrit, which yet remains to attract the full attention it deserves, is the fund of scientific data therein, which could lead to further development even in modern science. Two factors, especially, conduce to the viable richness of scientific matter in Sanskrit literature. First, it has an unbroken literary tradition commencing from at least the third millennium B. C. from when the Vedic hymns were composed, to be later redacted and arranged into the presently current four *Vedas* in their several recensional *saṁhitās*. Casual mention and sometimes specific details occur herein of the scientific acumen of early India down the ages. Secondly, there are a number of systematic texts on several scientific disciplines, including Mathematics and Astronomy, Medicine, Alchemy, Agriculture and Architecture. A study in detail of the literature cited above would, naturally, give a fair idea of the development of science in early and medieval India. But what is of particular interest is that it gives also a clue to its potential for the furtherance of modern science and the necessity for a study of Sanskrit by the modern scientist towards exploiting that potential.

II. Mental Make-up of the Indian Scientist :

A marked difference might be noticed, from early times, between scientific documentation as practised in the West, and in the East. The Western practice exhibits extravortism while the Eastern practice exhibits intravortism. In the West, the practice of setting out scientific data and results step by step, in detail, and in logical form had been the norm even from the times of Aristotle (384-322 B.C.), Euclid (*c.* 360 B.C.) and Ptolomy (*c.* 168 B.C.), Medieval scientists of Central Asia like Al Khowarizimi (*A. D.* 780-850) and Al Biruni (*A. D.* 973-1050) followed this practice. And, in the case of modern scientists of the West, like Kepler, Newton Faraday, even their draft notes have been preserved. This feature of the Occindental documentation would enable one to understand the mental make-up of the Western scientists and to follow their arguments and achievements. Moreover, latterly, the study of science for science's sake has also taken roots in the Western tradition.

On the other hand, scientific documentation in India followed the *sūtra*-style of writing which required the scientist to depict his data and results in capsule form,

leaving out the details and the rationale. The *sūtras* took the form of short pithy sentences, expressions and verses, with the result that the student was, more often than not, left in the dark about the mental working or the methodology of the authors of the *sūtras*. Moreover, science in early India was rather utilitarian, with the objective of solving a problem that had arisen or for serving a specific purpose; it was not science for science's sake. This outlook had the effect of the scientist cutting short his work at the stage at which his intended purpose was served and not proceeding further with his investigations. It is not as if no clue had been left for delving into the mind of the scientist and reconstructing his arguments and methods, but that requires retracing his path with effort by one who has full knowledge of the discipline and the modern analytic bent of mind.

Still another point to be noted is that though, in many cases, the results arrived at by the Western scientist and his Eastern counterpart were the same, the methods and procedures they adopted were often different. The stopping, by the Oriental scientist, of further investigations after a particular stage provides an opportunity for a modern scientist to strive further in that line, making new advances. In fact, such work is very much necessary towards utilising fully the potential contained in the work of the early Indian scientist.

III. Sciences to be Investigated :

The branch of science which has the highest potential for a scientist well versed in Sanskrit is medicine, *Āyurveda*. The vast sub-continent of India has an unparallelled wealth of flora and fauna, both of which have been extensively used for medicinal prescriptions. For example, it has been analysed that the *Caraka Saṁhitā* (*c. A. D.* 100) mentions, as ingredients to medicinal preparations, as many as 177 substances of animal origin, 341 medicinal plants and plant products, and 64 minerals.[1] While some of these nearly six hundred substances have been duly identified and chemically analysed, a large number of them still remain to be so analysed and their curative properties verified and adaptations effected if and as necessary. In *Āyurvedic* literature, there are numerous texts prescribing for diseases, single drugs (***eka-mūlikā***) for specific ailments. The identification of the curative element in each of these drugs should be comparatively easy. Again, to take the case of minerals, Vāgbhaṭa (12th cent. *A. D.*) deals elaborately in his *Rasaratnakośa* (ch. IV. *Ratnāni*), with the medicinal aspects of gems and the curative properties of medicines prepared using their ashes. It has been established that a gem-like mineral called lizardite is the only effective remedy for the crippling disease of fluorosis.[2] In this wake, it should be worthwhile to investigate scientifically under controlled conditions the therapeutic properties of all the gems and their products.

As in the case of *Āyurveda*, Astronomy and Mathematics (including Arithmetic, Geometry and Trigonometry), in their development in India, have thrown out a

number of ideas and approaches to various functions, many of which are worth being pursued further by Sanskrit-knowing mathematicians. To cite an instance; while Western 'trigonometry defines the Sine of an angle as the ratio of the side (opposite the angle) to the hypotenuse in a right angled triangle, the Indian Sine of an arc was defined as half the chord of double the arc in a circle of reference, the radius of the circle becoming the *Trijyā* or Sine of three signs, *i. e.*, the *Sinus Totus* (the total or complete Sine), Now, as many as 25 values have been used in Indian trigonometrical texts for the *Sinus Totus* from different points of view.[3] An analytical study of these values could bring out some new insights in the matter.

To take another example, to wit, the irrationality of *Pi*, being the relation between the diameter and circumference of a circle, it is interesting to note that the Power Series of *Pi* demonstrated by Lambert (*A. D.* 1671) and Leibnitz (*A. D.* 1673) had already been enunciated by Mādhava of Saṅgamagrāma (*A. D.* 1350-1410) more than three centuries earlier. Indian mathematicians have enunciated nearly a dozen formulae for derivation of *Pi* from different approaches. The rationalisations of these formulae in terms of modern mathematics have taken mathematicians to new vistas in mathematical thought.[4]

A few commentaries of mathematical texts go beyond explaining the *sūtras* and try to give the rationales underlying the *sūtras* which could help the Sanskrit knowing scientist. Thus, a commentry by Śaṅkara entitled *Yuktidīpikā* ('Lamp of astronomical rationale') on the *Tantrasangraha* of Nilakaṇṭha,[5] supplies detailed rationales of the 'Theory of Numbers', Division, square and Square root, Fractions, Rule of three, Diophantine equation (*kuṭṭākāra*), summation of natural numbers, squares and cubes, summation of summations, rules relating to triangles, circles and cyclic quadrilaterals and the surface area of a sphere. The same commentator, commenting on the *Līlāvati* of Bhāskara[6] gives the rationales of squaring, square root, cubing, fractions, fractions, of fractions, associated and dissociated fractions, multiplications and divisions of fractions, operations with squares, rule of three, sides and hypotenuse in a right angled triangle, area of a triangle, cyclic quadrilateral and the surface area and volume of a sphere. The point to note is that the approach in several of these rationales is different from the Western approach and therefore provides new directions for further advance to a Sanskrit knowing mathematician.[7]

Another potential discipline for a Sanskrit knowing scientist is *Śilpaśāstray* as enunciated in Sanskrit texts. Architecture and engineering, included in *śilpa* can, by no means, be compared to modern advances in these fields. But there are nuances which can add to the information and technical skill even of the modern engineer. Apart from novel structures and constructions, texts like *Śilparatna* of Śrīkumāra, *Aparājitapṛcchā*, and *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra* of King Bhoja, specify a number of prescriptions and describe the method of preparation of several kinds of cement-mixtures, adhesives, *etc.*, which can form effective substitutes for costly building

materials produced in present-day factories It should be highly profitable for the building processes depicted in *śilpā* texts being tested and used by modern engineers who have a full knowledge of Sanskrit terminology and the capability of identifying building materials and preparing mortars and mixtures specified in ancient texts.

Among other fields, the enunciations and speculations wherein deserve to be more fully investigated upon, might be mentioned veterinary medicine depicted in works like the *Aśvavaidyaka* of Nakula, *Śālihotra*, *Hastyāyurveda* of Pālakāpya and *Matangalīlā* of Nīlakaṇṭha. Nature cure and Kāyakalpa processes, *Syapnasāstra*, *Sāmudrikasāstra*, *Manovijnāna*, Extrasensory perception, etc. Other fields can also be identified for investigation by scientists with a knowledge of Sanskrit; but the above might suffice to make the point.

The Desideratum :

What has been stated above would clearly point to the potentiality in the understanding, assimilating and making further use of the achievements of science as it developed in India. However, the traditional practitioner, with all the limitations of antiquated methodology, will fain be able to face this task. It is for the student of modern science to analyse early theories and practices, reconstruct their rationale and explain them in terms of modern science. He alone can make full use of what is offered by traditional science, by bringing to bear on it his knowledge of modern methods and facilities now available for experimentation and verification under controlled conditions.

Of recent, there is a welcome move to introduce in the curriculum of science studies in the different disciplines in universities the study of the history of Indian science. To be sure, such a study only through translations will have its own limitations. The texts have to be learnt, if such learning is to have its full effect, from their original Sanskrit, which requires a knowledge of the language. From this point of view, the relevance of the study of the Sanskrit language even by students of science, at the school and college levels, is highly apparent towards the utilisation of that knowledge, later, in tying up the loose ends of scientific ideas and practices that developed in India and carry the torch forward for new benefits.

NOTES

1. *Caraka Saṁhitā : A scientific analysis*, by Priyadranjan RAY and Hirendra Nath GUPTA, Indian National Sc, Academy, New Delhi, 2nd edn., 1981, pp. 38-85.
2. *Proc. of the Fluorosis Symposium*, 2-5 Oct., 1974, Hyderabad, 1977.
3. R. C. GUPTA, 'Indian Values of the Sine Totus', *Jl. of History of Indian Science*, (New Delhi), 13. ii (Nov. 1978) 125-41.
4. K. V. SARMA, *A history of the Kerala school of Hindu astronomy*, (Hoshiarpur, 1972), pp. 22-27.
5. Ed, by K. V. SARMA, Vishveshvaranand Institute, Hoshiarpur, 1976.
6. Ed. by K. V. SARMA, Vishveshvaranand Institute, Hoshiarpur, 1974.
7. On this subject see also T. A. SARASWATHI, 'Development of mathematical ideas in India', *Indian Journal of History of Science*, 4 (1969) 59-78.

N. GANGADHARAN, Madras :

CERTAIN METEOROLOGICAL CONCEPTS IN THE PURĀṆAS

Introduction :

Almost all the *Purāṇas* have a section devoted to the description of the origin of the universe, origin of the earth, the divisions of the earth into seven continents, the names of the different oceans in these continents and their respective characteristics, the names of the mountains forming the boundaries of the different regions, the names of the rulers of these regions and the nature of the people inhabiting them. This section is known by the name '*Bhubanakośa*'. While describing these elements, the *Purāṇas* refer also to some points which may as well be included under the meteorological science, such as the formation of the clouds, both rain-bearing and non rain-bearing and their movements.

Although the references in rhe *Purāṇas* relating to meteorology are meagre as compared with those found in the Vedic literature, they cannot altogether be ignored as they represent a period of transition. The *Purāṇas* did not attach so much importance to the 'climatic element' as the vedic people had done or they considered it rather irrelevent to their main subject-matter.

The atmosphere (*rajas*) was divided by the ancients into *divya* and *pārthiva*[1] or into *uttama*, *parama* and *tṛtīya*[2]. This seems to anticipate the modern atmospheric layers. So also the ancients speak about the types of winds such as *Vāyu*, *Maruts* and *Rudras* in the *Ṛgveda*, *Taittirīyasaṁhitā* and *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa*. The phenomena of rainfall and its causes, types of clouds and climatic regions are directly or indirectly mentioned in the Vedic literature. The *Purāṇas* often repeat these ideas, sometimes neglecting some and at times adding some new ideas.

The Vātaskandhas or the seven layers of winds :

The different *Purāṇas*[3] refer to seven layers of winds (*vātaskandhas*) in the atmosphere such as the *pravaha*, *āvaha*, *udvaha*, *saṁvaha*, *vivaha*, *parāvaha* and *parivaha* and their influences on the atmosphere. The *Nāradapurāṇa*[4] describes them as seven air channels or winds. The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*[5] states that these have five types of circulation or movement. The *Nāradapurāṇa*[6] and the *Skandapurāṇa*[7] describe them in detail. The description in the *Nāradapurāṇa*[8] is mostly geographical and

it is almost similar to that found in the *Mahābhārata*[9], obviously, the former copying from the latter. According to the *Skandapurāṇa* account, the *pravaha* winds cause the movements of the clouds and rain, while the other winds are associated with the movement of the stellar bodies. The *Mahābhārata* account is: The atmosphere is divided into seven regions of winds. The first wind the *pravaha*, drives along the first course, masses of clouds formed from smoke and heat. After coming into contact with water in the clouds, that wind shows itself in effulgence among darts of lightning. The second wind, called *āvaha*, blows with a loud noise making the moon and the other luminaries rise and appear. The third one, known as the *udvaha*, drinks up water from the four oceans and gives it to the clouds in the sky. The *Nāradapurāṇa*[10] equates this with the wind known as *udāna* in the human body. The fourth wind called *saṁvaha* is responsible for dividing the clouds into various parts, make them pour rain and get solidified again. It is so powerful that it can rend the mountains. The fifth one, known as the *vivaha*, is dry and possesses great force and speed to root out all trees. Incidentally, the epic mentions that the clouds that exist with the wind are ealled *balāhaka*. The sixth one, known as the *parivaha* houses the illumination through rays and refraction. The seventh one, the *parāvaha*, is perhaps some cosmic region that cannot be resisted by anybody. Of course one cannot find a very accurate data of modern climatology in the foregoing analysis.

A discussion on the phenomenon of evaporation, cloud formation, classification of clouds and their relationship with winds or regions of atmosphere found in the *Purāṇas* indicates that the *Purāṇas* had realized their importance. But, as already pointed out, the *Purāṇas* do not discuss in detail these phenomena, obviously because they considered them irrelevant to their main subject-matter. The bodies of all the human being contain water. They get evaporated and form the clouds. The heat of the sun draws the water from the beings by means of its rays. The waters drawn from the ocean are carried by the winds. When the sun shifts its position, the clouds discharge the waters on account of the seasons. The rains that are beneficial to all the beings fall down from the clouds by the influence of the wind. Then it rains for six months.[11]

The formation of the clouds in general :

The *Matsyapurāṇa*[12] states that the waters from the vapours of the clouds when brought into contact with the wind (namely hygroscopic contents of the air) fall in the form of the rain. This is nothing but a brief description of condensation and precipitation on hygroscopic nuclei. According to the *Liṁga Purāṇa*[13] when the mobile and immobile beings are burnt by fire and tossed up as the smoke by the wind, the vapours that go up under the influence of the wind form the clouds. Hence the mixture of smoke, fire and wind is called the cloud. The clouds that are the carriers of waters shower at the behest of the wind for six months for the welfare of the worlds. The thunder pertains to the wind. The lightning arises from the fire. The *Purāṇas*[14]

are unanimous in pointing out that the sun is the cause of the rains. The sun is said to draw moisture from the four sources—seas, rivers, earth and living beings.[15] The *Liṁgapurāṇa*[16] states that the sun takes up waters from various water resorts by means of his thousand tubular rays in order to give it back thousand fold.

The terms 'megha' and 'abhra' :

The *Purāṇas*[17] derive the word *'megha'* from the root *'mih'* meaning shedding water and explain the word *'abhra'* as denoting that from which waters do not fall. However, the *Liṁgapurāṇa*[18] strangely explains this term earlier as 'that which showers water' and gives the conventional derivation later. From this we understand that those close clouds which give water are called *megha* and those that do not bring any rainfall as *abhra*.

The three classes of clouds :

The clouds are classified into three groups—*āgneya*, *brahmaja* rnd *pakṣaja*.[19] But the *Liṁgapurāṇa*[20] calls them as *kāṣṭhavāhāḥ*, *vairiñcyaḥ* and *pakṣāḥ*. While the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*[21] describes the first one as produced from heat, the *Vāyupurāṇa*[22] describes the same as from the waters. They activate the smoke. The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* and the *Vāyupurāṇa*[23] describe them further as follows : The *āgneya* clouds are said to occur in the winter season resembling in shape a buffalo, a boar or an elephant. Lightning and thunder are not associated with them. They are of immense expanse. They are also found on the peaks and flanks of the mountains. They rain from a distance of a *krośa*[24] or a half. They are also termed as *jīmūta* and said to be the cause for the growth of the beings. The *Brahmāṇḍa*[25], the *Matsya*[26] and the *Liṁga*[27] further state that these clouds are controlled by the wind known as *āvaha*. (But *pravaha* is *Vāyu*) This description is considered[28] as approximating mostly to the term 'nimbus' of the modern period. The *Liṁgapurāṇa*[29] explains the term *Kāṣṭhavāha* as follows : When the sacrificial twigs (*Kāṣṭhas*) soaked in ghee come into contact with fire, smoke is generated and this smoke forms the clouds. The other terms are explained here as in the other *Purāṇas*.

The *brahmaja* clouds are said[30] to be produced from the respiration of Brahmā. This may symbolically imply the convection currents. They are accompanied by lightning and thunder and make noise. They are controlled by the wind *pravaha*.[31] They cover an extent of a *yojana* (about eight miles) with the rains. The earth gets fertility under the influence of these clouds which will bring a heavy downpour of rain. These clouds may be compared with the cumulonimbus clouds in the modern terminology.[32]

The *pakṣaja* clouds are also known as *puṣkarāvartaka*.[33] As the name itself indicates, the *pakṣaja* clouds originate from the wings of the mountains. The term *puṣkara* denotes those clouds that cause deluge or famine as known from their usage in

the Sanskrit literary works. They carry profuse water and bring excessive rainfall causing large scale destruction. They are very well referred to as causing excessive destruction like the rains at the time of the deluge.[34] The *Matsyapurāṇa*[35] explains the term *puṣkarāvarta* thus : The wings of the mountains are known as *puṣkara* and as they hold a large volume of water these clouds are known os *puṣkarāvarta*. These clouds assume various forms. They make thundering noise. The *Liṁgapurāṇa*[36] briefly points out the characteristics of these three classes of clouds as silent, noisy and destructive respectively.

The other types of clouds :

The *Matsyapurāṇa*[37] further states that the bursting of Brahmā's egg produced other clouds called *megha*. The chief source of nourishment of all the clouds is smoke. The excellent among these clouds is that known as *parjanya*. The succeeding verses probably refer to four other classes of clouds denoted by the words *gaja, parvata, megha* and *bhogī*. The wind known as *parivaha* is associated with them.[38]

The clouds known as the *puṇḍra* are stated to occur to the north and south of the snow-clad mountains. They increase the rains. These rains get converted into snow. The wind draws them by its own force and showers them on the great mountains. Beyond that region there is little rains. This implies only to the arid condition found in the Tibetan plateau. The *Matsyapurāṇa*[39] then mentions a class of clouds known as *ibha* that helps the growth of beings. These two classes of clouds are stated to increase the amount of rains. The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*[40] states that the clouds shower in the mountains and the flanks of the mountains also receive copious rains.

Different kinds of smokes and their effects :

The *Liṁgapurāṇa*[41] describes in detail the different kinds of smokes and their effects. The cloud originating from sacrificial smoke is conducive to the welfare of mankind. The cloud originating from the smoke of the forest fires is conducive to the welfare of the forests. The cloud originating from the smoke of the dead bodies brings about evil. The cloud originating from the smoke of the fire during magic rites brings about the destruction of living beings. Thus there is weal or woe unto the worlds due to the different kinds of smokes. Hence one should stifle the smoke arising from the black magic rites. One that performs black magic rites without covering up the smoke thereof, wantonly becomes the cause of the destruction of the world.

Rains and Polar winds :

We may say that the *Purāṇas* had rather anticipated "the modern meteorological proposition that the polar winds actually never bring any rainfall in the year in the regions under their influence-flanking poles or Tundra, and only scanty summer rain occurs in those areas due to the sweeping of strong westerlies".[42] The *Matsyapurāṇa*[43] states that the air from the poles (*dhruva*) drives away the rain.

Tides

It is well-known that the apparent motion of the moon causes the tides. Many of the *Purāṇas*[44] are unanimous in describing the tides. When the moon rises in the east, the sea begins to swell. The sea goes down when the moon wanes. When the sea swells, it does so with its own waters and when it subsides, it does not actually lose any water. The sea rises and falls according to the phases of the moon. It rises and falls nearly 510 inches on the two *parvan* days.

Conclusion :

Since time immemorial we have good reasons to believe that the performance of the different sacrificial rites is conducive to the welfare of mankind. Recent researches of the scientists have shown that it is true. The *Purāṇas*[45] unequivocally declare that the performance of the sacrificial rites causes rain. The *Purāṇas*[46] also prescribe the worship of the *parjanya*, Moon and Sun to ward of excessive rainfall, scanty rainfall and famine. We have witnessed that the earnest recitations of the vedic hymns dedicated to Varuṇa have brought downpour of rains. We require only a little portion of the huge money spent in piling up destructive weapons or launching rockets and satellites to conduct experiments to explore the basis of these beliefs. It is high time that we attach greater values to the ancient treasures of wisdom handed down to us since generations and guide the younger generations properly to develop faith and respect towards these.

NOTES

1. *Rgveda* IV.53, 3
2. *Rgveda* X.45, 3
3. *Brahmāṇḍa* II.19.171; *Vāyu* 49.163; *Nārada* 60.13 ff; *Matsya* 163-32-33; *Skanda* I. 38.52b-60; *Kūrma* 41.6-7a; *Liṁga* I. 53.36-37.
4. I.60.13a
5. II.19.172
6. 60.13.17-35
7. I.38.52b-60
8. *ibid.*
9. XII.329.36-51
10. I.60.20-22
11. *Brahmāṇḍa* II.22.24b-28a; *Vāyu* I.51.22-26*a*.
12. 124, 33.
13. I.54, 38.39, 44

14. *Brahmāṇḍa* II.22.57b; *Vāyu* I.51.51b; *Matsya* 124.27
15. *Viṣṇupurāṇa* II.9.11
16. I.54.66; 59.22-23
17. *Brahmāṇḍa* II.22.29; *Vāyu* I.51.27; *Brahma* 24.10; *Viṣṇu* II.9.10b-11a; *Liṁga* I. 54.46
18. I.54.39 and 46
19. *Brahmāṇḍa* II.22.30; *Vāyu* I.51-28
20. I.54.46b
21. II.22.31
22. II.22.29
23. *Brahmāṇḍa* II.22.32-35; *Vāyu* I.51. 29b-33
24. a *krośa* equals a quarter of a *yojana, i. e.*,2¼ or 3 miles
25. II.22.34
26. 124.9b-10a
27. I.54.48
28. Maya Prasad TRIPATHI, *Development of Geographical Knowledge in Ancient India*, p.110
29. I.54.47a
30. *Brahmāṇḍa* II.22.36b; *Vāyu* I.51.34; *Liṁga* I.54.49a
31. *Vāyu* I.51.32a; *Brāhmāṇḍa* II.22.39a; *Liṁga* I.54.48b
32. Maya Prasad TRIPATHI, *loc. cit.*
33. *Brahmāṇḍa* II.22.40b; *Vāyu* I. 51.37b; *Liṁga* I.54.49b
34. *Brahmāṇḍa* II.22.41-44; *Vāyu* I.51.38-41
35. 124. 11b-15
36. I.54.50a
37. 124.16
38. 124.20. Also in *Brahmāṇḍa* II.22.50a and *Vāyu* I.51.46a
39. I24.26
40. II.19.85-86
41. I.54.40-43
42. Maya Prasad TRIPATHI, *loc.cit.* p.112
43. 124.36a
44. *Agnipurāṇa* 119.25-26, *Matsya* 122.30-35a
45. II.8.108 and 9.22a
46. *Agnipurāṇa* 263.19-20a; *Matsya* 232.1-2 and 9

This paper was read at the 'Seminar on Meteorology in India through the Ages' Pune, September 22-24, 1984.

Vidhata MISHRA, Darbhanga :

CULTURAL LIFE IN THE VEDIC INDIA

Spiritual culture is the true genius of India. Those make the greatest appeal to the Indian mind are not the military conquerors, not the rich merchants or the great diplomats, but the holy sages, the *ṛṣis*, who embody spirituality at its finest and purest. India's pride is that almost in every generation and in every part of the country from the time of her recorded history, she has produced these holy men who embody for her all that the country holds most dear and sacred. Though they generally remain away from the main stream of life, kings and commoners pay reverent homage to them and take their advice in the problems of their personal lives as well as in public affairs. By their lives they teach us that pride and power, wealth and glory, which are nothing in comparison with the power of spirit. It is those who scorn their own lives that raise life above our scorn. On the individual plane we find that the most reasonable scheme was evolved in the shape of the four *āśramas* or stages in the life of a man in the Vedic India. The *Āryan* in general was free from that abnormal spirit of religious dedication which instituted the practice of enforced celibacy. The average man was to spend the first quarter of the ideally expected hundred years of human life in study and preparation of *brahmacarya*, the next quarter in living the life of a householder (*gārhasthya*), and the third quarter in the life of retirement (*Vānaprasthya*), to be followed by the final period of complete detachment from the affairs of the world and meditation on the supreme (*Sannyāsa*). Of course if one felt the consuming fire of high spirituality within, he was at liberty to lead the life of a celibate devotee, cut off from the affairs of the world and dedicating himself to the spiritual life. All these *āśramas* or stages of life had to undergo the first stage; that of *brahmacarya*. There were *snātakas* who continued as bachelors even after their *snāna* or ceremonial bathing after the period of obligatory education, removing the marks of a *brahmacārin*. Education was obligatory for all. There is a famous statement in the Veda that every one should receive education—*Svādhyāyo' dhyetavyaḥ*. According to traditional interpretation, this meant that all children should study the entire vedas. But in the course of time man's capabilities diminished and they confined their obligatory study to one Veda. The Veda meant the *Saṁhitā*, the *Brāhmaṇa* and the *Vedāṁgas*. The *Kalpasūtra* formed a part of the *Vedāṁgas* and *Dharmasūtras* were parts of the *Kalpasūtras*. The *Dharmasūtras* dealt with civic duties as distinct from the rules relating to *Śrauta* Sacrifices and rituals dealt with in the *Śrauta Sūtras* and the domestic sacrifices and rituals dealt with in the *Gṛhya Sūtras*. Thus both religious and temporal laws

formed part of the Vedic study. They studied the text of the Vedas and recited them with the proper accent and intonation. They studied grammar too and were conversant with the general meaning of the texts. This education was divided into an obligatory part and an optional part. After the obligatory education there was the ceremonial bath. Then students could continue in the *āśrama* (retreat) of the teacher and prosecuted further critical study. They could perform the ceremonial bath after that further study. We can compare them with the school education and the University education of modern time. The former was compulsory while the latter was only optional. In the beginning this education was common to all citizens, irrespective of their castes. As a matter of fact the caste distinction came in only after they chose their avocation. It was not a hereditary previlege or a hereditary disability. But the *Gṛhya Sūtras* prescribe different ages for the initiation of the children belonging to different castes. Therefore in the Vedic India heredity must have made its appearance in the differentiation of castes. The restriction of the Vedic Studies and performance of sacrifices to a particular caste must be a latter day deterioration in the civic life of the Āryans. The aim of education was that of equipping the student to play his part as an honoured citizen. It is only later that the study of the Vedas was made a part of the sacrificial rites with *Svarga* as the goal, or as a part of rhe study of the *Vedānta* to atttin final release. That is how the *Mīmāṁsā-Sūtras* and the *Vedānta-Sūtras* interpret the Vedic passage that all should study the Vedas. According to the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (1.11) after the student has finished his education, the teacher exhorts the disciple, who is going back home, to "speak the truth", and to "lead a virtuous life", and further advises him as to his duties and obligations as a member of the society. In the course of this instruction there is no indication of using what the student has studied either for the performance of sacrifices with *Svarga* as the goal, or for the investigation into the problem of the Absolute with a view to attaining final release. The whole trend of the final instruction is that he should lead an honoured and useful life as a citizen. He should pay attention to truth and virtue in life. He should ask the elders if he has any doubts, and he should try to follow in their footsteps if he has any uncertainties regarding conduct. There was no difference between rich and poor children as all of them lived in the *āśramas* as equals. The life was simple and industrious. The parents had no worry about the education of their children and the teachers too had no difficulty about the maintenance of their institutions. Money was available in plenty for such institutions. But that does not mean that the education of children was no concern of the parents. While the teachers were fully responsible, the parents took interest in the education and made occasional contacts with their children. Sometimes the father himself used to teach the son, though life under a teacher was preferred. Most of such educational institutions were *āśramas* of *ṛṣis* in the forests, which, however, were not far off, inaccessible jungles. They were either the gardens and groves of rich men or the banks of rivers and lakes on the highways between cities, easily accessible either on foot or by some conveyance The Kings Visited such *āśramas* in their chariots. An

afternoon drive was enough for the kings to reach the *āśramas*, as is described in the *Raghuvaṁśa* where it is found that Dilīpa started after his mid-day meal and reached the *āśrama* of Vasiṣṭha before sunset. In those days there were more forest regions than in later times. The king protected the *āśramas* from the wild animals. In the Vedic age every household of a scholar was also an educational institution where many students lived as members of his family. Wealthy people and people belonging to noble families also acted as teachers. Teaching was the most honoured profession in those days. The teacher, the man of wisdom controlled the life of the nation. Both wealth and political power bowed before wisdom. In knowledge, in power, and in social organisation the teachers had attained a high level.

Ancient Indian Culture embodied a combination of different *Saṁskāras*. The origin of the *Saṁskāra* is due to conscious forces governing the development and evolution of society when human beings try to improve upon nature. The priest, though not beyond the common run of people, was above the ordinary man in the street and he introduced considerable refinement and culture into social customs and rites in a variety of ways. The ancient Hindus, like other nations of the world, believed that they were surrounded by superhuman influences which were potent enough for good or evil consequences. They thought that those influences could interfere in every important occasion in man's life. Therefore they tried to remove hostile influences and to attract beneficial ones, so that man may grow and prosper without external hindrances and receive timely directions and help from gods and spirits. Many items and ramifications of the *Saṁskāras* arose out of these beliefs. The cultural purpose that evolved from ancient rites and ceremonies was the formation and development of personality. Sages of the Vedic India realised the necessity of consciously moulding the character of individuals instead of letting them grow in haphazard way. The *Saṁskāras* covered the full span of life and they even tried to influence and impress the individual after his death through the cult of soul. All the *Saṁskāras* were arranged in such a way that they may produce suitable impressions from the very beginning of one's life. The *Saṁskāras* were guides and they directed the life of an individual according to his growth. So a man was required to live a full life of discipline and his energies flowed into a well guarded and purposive channel. By making different *Saṁskāras* compulsory, sociologists of the Vedic India aimed at evolving a type of humanity uniform in culture and character and having the same ideal in life. They were successful to a great extent in their attempt. Spiritualism is one of the main features of the Hinduism and every phase of Hindu religion is tinctured with it. The general outlook of the ancient people transformed the *Saṁskāras* into a spiritual *Sādhanā*. The spiritual purpose and significance of the *Saṁskāras* cannot be given an open demonstration nor can it be evidenced with paper documents. It is the experience of those who have received the sacraments. To a man the *Saṁskāras* conveyed more than their constituents. They were an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace. The man looked beyond the ceremonial

performance and felt something invisible which sanctified his whole personality. The *Saṁskāras* served a mean between the ascetic and the materialistic conception of the body. It was the business of the *Saṁskāras* to make the body a valuable possession, a thing not to be discarded but made holy, a thing to be sanctified, so that it might be a fitting instrument of the spiritual intelligence embodied in it. The *Saṁskāras* were a gradual training in spiritualism. Through them the recipient realised that all life is a sacrament and every physical action should be referred to and connected with the spiritual reality. It was the way in which an active life of the world was reconciled with spiritual realisation. In this system of living the body and its functions ceased to be hindrances, and became helpers in attaining perfection. By performing these *Saṁskāras* the life of an ordinary man, with whom the world would have been too much but for timely intervention of spiritual discipline, was made a grand sacrament. Thus, duly celebrating the rites and ceremonies, men of the Vedic India believed that they escaped the physical bondage and crossed the ocean of death.

At present there are sixteen popular *Saṁskāras*, though the enumeration differs in the *Gṛhyasūtras, Dharmasūtras and Smṛtis*, from *Garbhādhāna* to *Antyeṣṭi*. All these sixteen *Saṁskāras* were classified as (A) Prenatal *Saṁskāras*, such as (1) *Garbhādhāna*, (2) *Puṁsavana*, and (3) *Sīmantonnayana* ; (B) *Saṁskāras*, of childhood, such as (1) *Jātakarma*, (2) *Nāmakaraṇa*, (3) *Niṣkramaṇa*, (4) *Annaprāśana*, (5) *Cūḍākaraṇa*, and (6) *Karṇavedha*; (C) Educational *Saṁskāras* such as (1) *Vidyārambha*, (2) *Upanayana*, (3) *Vedārambha*, (4) *Keśānta*, and (5) *Samāvartana* ; (D) *Vivāha*; and (E) *Antyeṣṭi*. All these *Saṁskāras* were performed in the Vedic India strictly according to rules as prescribed by the *Gṛhyasūtra*, the *Dharmasūtra*, and the *Smṛti*. The *Saṁskāras* were a complex combination of various elements. Learned sages of ancient India expressed their beliefs and sentiments about the nature of human life and the universe and their relation with the superhuman powers which were supposed to guide or control the destiny of man. They believed that man requires protection, consecration and refinement. For this, to a great extent, they depended on gods whose existence they seriously felt and whose help they invariably required. But while they sought aids from gods, they also helped themselves by the knowledge they possessed of natural and supernatural world. Men believed that gods, like men, were propitiated by praise and prayer. It was equally natural to their mind that, like men, they also liked and accepted presents and gifts. The *Saṁskāras*, with the solitary exception of the funeral, were performed at the blooming and festive occasions in the life of a man. Therefore the recipients of the *Saṁskāras* or if they were minor, their parents offered presents, paid homage or tribute to the beneficient gods in token of gratitude or in anticipation of further blessings. Divination was compulsorily necessary in the performance of the *Saṁskāras*. Divination or astrology is the science that seeks to discover the will of supernatural powers. Men desired to learn the cause of the past and present misfortunes and the story of the future that they could know at any moment what was the best course to pursue.

It was supposed that those things were indicated by appearances and movements of the various objects of the world. Natural phenomena indicated the purpose of the superhuman forces, as it was believed that gods could not but so reveal themselves. It was man's task to discover the laws of phenomenal revelations. The question of rationale did not arise, as it was held that gods were friendly and anxious to guide the uncertain footsteps of man. Of all divinatory methods astrology played the greatest role in the performance of the *Saṁskāras*. It derived its prominence from the splendour and myths of the sidereal heavens and the belief that all heavenly bodies were divine or controlled by divine beings. It was natural that the astral movements should be looked on as given signs of the will of the gods. Always care was taken that a *Saṁskāra* should be performed under an auspicious planet. In addition to these religious beliefs, rites and ceremonies, the *Saṁskāras* contained social customs and usages and rules about eugenics, ethics *etc*. In the Vedic India the whole life was a compact unity saturated with the all-pervading idea of religion. As the *Saṁskāras* covered the full life of an individual, his physical, mental and spiritual training was combined with them. The *Āryans* had already reached a high state of culture in the Vedic India. The Vedic literature does not mark the starting point of a culture, on the contrary, it marks the beginning of the decadence of a high culture. In the whole history of India, the Vedic age has been recognised as the ideal, and the attempt in all the subsequent has been to approximate the life of man to the condition of the Vedic age. Thus in later periods everything that was valuable in man's life was traced back to the Vedas. Philosophy, religion, codes of conduct, all the sciences—everything was traced to the Vedic India. To understand the cultural life of the Vedic India the present times are not quite suited. Modern ideas are in conflict with those of ancient India. Whatever be the value attached to the Vedic literature by modern scholars, whatever be the stage of culture represented by the Vedic India as judged by modern sciences and modern standards, no one can deny the fact that the Vedas satisfied the needs of the intellect, of the imagination, and of the emotion of a great nation for a long period and the records of that nation in the fields of intellect and imagination are not below the achievements of any other nation that has appeared on the face of the earth till now.

Sitanath Goswami, Jadavpur :

TWO PATHS AND THE TRIAD IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA

In our tradition there are in all five *itihāsa*-works and those have been enumerated with the help of an abbreviation as "*bhā-rā-śi-vi-brāḥ pancetihāsāḥ*". *Bhā* means *Bhārata* or *Mahābhārata*, *rā is Rāmāyaṇa*, *śi* signifies *Śivarahasya*, *vi* means *Vidyārahasya* and *bra* is *Brahmajñānasukhodaya*. Of these five *itihāsa*-s, the *Mahābhārata* occupies the prime position. As the cream is of curd, the *brāhmaṇa* is of men, the *Āraṇyaka* (or the *Upaniṣad*) is of the Vedas, the medicinal herb (*amṛta*) of plants, the sea is of water-reservoirs, the cow is of quadrupeds, so the *Mahābhārata* is the best specimen of *itihāsa-s*[1]. It is compared favourably even with the four vedas. Once the four *Vedas* were put on one side of the scale and on the other side was the *Mahābhārata*. Strangely enough the side of the *Mahābhārata* was heavier than the side of the Veda itself. From that day onward it is called the Great *Bhārata i. e.* the *Mahābhārata* for its greatness in respect of both volume and significance.[2] Relevantly it may be mentioned that the name (*Mahābhārata*) also owes its origin to the noble birth and deeds of the great personages as the descendants of the renowned king Bharata.[3]

The Mahābhārata-An Itihāsa :

However, the *Mahābhārata* is an *itihāsa* but it should not be identified with history since this is not a recorded date-wise chronicle of the events of a powerful dynasty or a series of dynasties. It is not at all a collection of the spectacular performances of the elected or nominated representatives of the people but it is a history of India, people, culture, civilization, desires, aspirations and above all ideals. The desires, aspirations and ideals have found expression in Indian terminology as *dharma, artha, kāma* and *mokṣa*. Before going into the details of the derivation and definition of *dharma*, I propose to present here a brief description of dharma for the sake of convenience. *Dharma* encompasses a wide range of ideas *e. g.* principles, ideals, custom, conduct, manners, worship, prayer, rights, duties, injunctions, prohibitions, performance and non-performance. *Dharma* also includes the good result or merits (*Puṇya*) under the influence of which a person attains happiness of this world and the other. A man seeks to attain money and wealth (*artha*) for his subsistence and livelihood. By natural impulse a man feels desires including amorous and sexual ones (*Kāma*). The word *mokṣa* literally means release *i. e.* freedom from bondage, cessation of all miseries and afflictions, or in other words,

permanent happiness or bliss. Release or *mokṣa* presupposes bondage or confinement, and confinement means unhappiness. If a person remains in a prison and thinks he is happy, it is no confinement at all for him.[4] However, all these four *viz. dharma, artha kāma* and *mokṣa* are desired to be achieved (*arthyate prārthyate*) by human beings, and accordingly they are known as *puruṣārtha*. In our country *itihāsa* has been defined as—

धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाणामुपदेशसमन्वितम् ।
पुरावृत्तकथायुक्तमितिहासं प्रचक्षते ॥

In *itihāsa* there will be the narration of old events but the import will always remain in the instruction in *caturvarga i. e.* the combination of four. Through the narrative of the Kuru-Pāṇḍava war this quartet has been instructed. In his introductory verses of the commentary of the *Mahābhārata, Śāntiparvan*, the commentator Nīlakaṇṭha has said that *dharma, artha, kāma,* and *mokṣa* have been properly determined here because for a liking and taste for these four ends this *itihāsa* has been told.[5]

Two Paths of Action and Renunciation :

Although all these four are often called the aims or ends of life, the real or final end[6] is *mokṣa* because there lies the consummation of all human desires, and that is the *summum bonum* of human life. In accordance with the established Vedic tradition two courses of *dharma* have been prescribed—one is the path of action (*pravṛtti*) and the other is of inaction or renunciation (*nivṛtti*)[7]. A person following the path of total renunciation does not require *artha* and *kāma*, and sometimes may not feel an urge for observing *dharma* or even compulsory duties (*nityakarman*) because he is above everything. But ordinary people resorting to normal duties should know the superiority of *dharma* to *artha* and *kāma*. In the presence of Vidura and the four brothers Yudhiṣṭhira poses a question—People resort to *dharma, artha* and *kāma*; but of these which one is the best, which is low or commomplace ?[8] Here Vidura replies that the talented persons hold *dharma* to be the best attribute, *artha* as the middling and *kāma* being of lower order.[9] According to Arjuna *artha* is extolled much in this world of action because only *artha* can maintain the norms of action, and without *artha* the existence of *dharma* and *kāma* is not possible.[10] He mentions also some prominent sources of wealth, and finally opines that *dharma* and *Kāma* are like the limbs of *artha*.[11] Nakula and Sahadeva maintain that *dharma* should be practised and then comes *artha* along with *dharma*, and then afterwards *kāma* should be adopted. By following this order a person achieves success. It should be noted here that the opinion of the twin brothers does not differ materially from that of Vidura. Although the twin brothers place *dharma* and *artha* in the same rank, the mention of *dharma* prior to *artha* gives *dharma* a distinctive position and thereby brings this view almost, at par with that of Vidura.[12] Now comes Bhīma who says that *kāma* is supreme because a person devoid of *kāma* cannot desire wealth, cannot hanker after *dharma*, cannot pine

for amorous enjoyments.[13] He further holds that there is none, there was none, nor will there be anybody bereft of *kāma*, O King, please know from me the quintessence that both *dharma* and *artha* are situated in *kāma*.[14] By way of illustration Bhīma goes to the extreme of advising his elder brother to enjoy beautiful damsels for the satisfaction of desires.[15] Luckily Bhīma amends his view a bit by holding that the three *viz. dharma*, *artha* and *kāma* should be taken up simultaneously because the man who adopts only one of them is worst, the person accepting two is a middling, and the best is that who takes up all the three.[16] It is now the turn of the eldest and the most judicious brother Yudhiṣṭhira to express his own opinion on the issue because he initiated the discussion with a view to instructing in the subtleties of *dharma* as also this quartet (*caturvarga*). He takes up an altogether different view and even goes beyond his question. The question was about ascertainment of the best of the three *viz. dharma*, *artha* and *kā*ma. The brothers and Vidura replied by remaining within the ambit of the question; but now Yudhiṣṭhira denounces all the three and advises them to refrain from these three since enlightened persons have ever come to the decision that real happiness and peace may be achieved only by resorting to the path of renunciation *i. e.* by attaining *mokṣa*.[17] In course of this illuminating discussion it is found that the two persons following truth and justice throughout their life have had recourse to the two paths—the path of action is taken up by Vidura, and the path of renunciation is adopted by Yudhiṣṭhira.

Dharma is the Best of the Triad :

As we have seen just now, in the path of action all the three *puruṣārthas viz. dharma*, *artha* and *kāma* have sufficient scope for their operation, and even great men are in a quandary as to the selection of the best of the three. Whereas Vidura, Nakula and Sahadeva assigned a higher rank to *dharma*, Arjuna deemed *artha* supreme, and Bhīma had a definite inclination for *kāma*. Ordinary people also differ in their judgement, and even the Vedas have prescribed the performance of each of these three. So Yudhiṣṭhira presents this problem before Bhīṣma with a view to eliciting an answer from him.[18] Bhīṣma refers to an old incident in which a poor brahmin practised severe penance and performed sacrifices for attaining wealth. The satisfied deity was not ready to grant money in consideration of the fact that a really deserving person should be favoured not by sanction of wealth but by granting *dharma*. By having recourse of *dharma* the brahmin attained a supernormal vision and could find the sad plight of thousands of departed rulers and kings suffering from terrible *naraka*. He could also appreciate the view of the deity that desire for enjoyment (*kāma*) shuts the door to *svarga*. Now Bhīṣma concludes the discussion by extolling Yudhiṣṭhira for his attachment for *dharma* and by summing up the reason for the superiority of *dharma*. In Bhīṣma's opinion there is a bit of happiness in wealth but in *dharma* exists happiness *par excellence*.[19] Here in this concluding line Bhīṣma remains reticent about *kāma* since this has already been discussed with the help of illustration and also because the answer is obvious.

NOTES

1. नवनीतं यथा दध्नो द्विपदां ब्राह्मणो यथा ।
आरण्यकं च वेदेभ्य ओषधिभ्योऽमृतं यथा ॥
ह्रदानामुदधिः श्रेष्ठो गौर्वरिष्ठा चतुष्पदाम् ।
यथैतानीतिहासानां तथा भारतमुच्यते ॥
(*Mbh.* Calcutta, Saka era 1830)

2. महत्वाद् भारवत्त्वाश्च महाभारतमुच्यते । *Mbh.* 1.1. 274

3. भरतानां महज्जन्म तस्माद् भारतमुच्यते । *Ibid*. 18.5.45

4. "Stone walls do not a prison make,
Nor iron bar a cage;
Minds innocent and quiet take,
That for an hermitage."
—lines 25-28 of the poem "TO ALTHEA FROM PRISON" by colonel Lovelace (Richard LOVELACE, 1618-58).

5. यत्साधनेषु रुच्यर्थमितिहासोऽयमीरितः ।
धर्मार्थकाममोक्षास्ते सम्यगत्र निरूपिताः ॥

6. The path of action entails rebirth but in the other path this cycle of birth and death comes to an end.
cf. प्रवृत्तिः पुनरावृत्तिर्निवृत्तिः परमा गतिः ।
(*Mbh.* 12. 217.4)

7. द्वाविमावथ पन्थानौ यत्र वेदाः प्रतिष्ठिताः ।
प्रवृत्तिलक्षणो धर्मो निवृत्तिश्च सुभाषितः ॥
(*Ibid*. 12. 240.6)

Although most of the available editions read this *śloka* as above, Śaṁkarācārya in his commentary of *Īśopaniṣad, mantra*-2, reads it as "...... निवृत्तिश्च विभाषितः" ॥ The reading accepted by Śaṁkara places the two paths almost at par, but in the other reading there is a definite preference for renunciation. Nilakaṇṭha also thinks so. *cf.* "निवृत्तावात्मदर्शनं च धर्मः सुभाषितः, आत्यन्तिको धर्मः स उक्तः *etc.*

8. धर्मे चार्थे च कामे च लोकवृत्तिः समाहिता ।
तेषां गरीयान् कतमो मध्यमः को लघुश्च कः ॥
(*Mbh.* 12.167.2

9. धर्मो राजन् गुणः श्रेष्ठो मध्यमो ह्यर्थ उच्यते ।
कामो यवीयानिति च प्रवदन्ति मनीषिणः ॥
(*ibid*. 12.167.8)

10. कर्मभूमिरियं राजन्निह वार्ता प्रशस्यते ।........
नह्यृतेऽर्थेन वर्तेते धर्मकामाविति श्रुतिः ॥
(*ibid*. 12.167.11-12)

11. अर्थस्यावयवावेतौ धर्मकामाविति श्रुतिः ।
(*ibid*. 12.167.14)

12. "अत्र धर्मार्थयोः समत्वेऽपि धर्मस्य पूर्वत्वाद् विदुरमतमेवैतदीषद्भेदेन दर्शितम् ।"
(Nīlakaṇṭha on *Mbh*. 12.167.27)

13. *Mbh*. 12.167.29
14. *ibid*. 12.167.34
15. *ibid*. 12.167.38

16. धर्मार्थकामाः सममेव सेव्या यो ह्येकभक्तः स नरो जघन्यः ।
तयोस्तु दाक्ष्यं प्रवदन्ति मध्यं स उत्तमो योऽभिरतस्त्रिवर्गे ॥ (*ibid*. 12.167.40)

From this *śloka* it follows that a person taking up only *dharma* is the worst, taking up *dharma*, and *artha* is a middling, and taking up *dharma*, *artha* and *Kāma* *i.e.* the triad is the best. Here the commentary of Nīlakaṇṭha clearly indicates this.

"दाक्ष्यमर्थहेतुत्वान्मध्यं मध्यमम्, अर्थात् काम उत्तमो, धर्मो जघन्य इति फलितम् ।"

17. यो वै न पापे निरतो न पुण्ये
नार्थे न धर्मे मनुजो न कामे ।
विमुक्तदोषः समलोष्टकाञ्चनो
विमुच्यते दुःखसुखार्थसिद्धेः ॥ (*Mbh*. 12.167.44)

18. धर्ममर्थं च कामं च वेदाः शंसन्ति भारत ।
कस्य लाभो विशिष्टोऽत्र तन्मे ब्रूहि पितामह ॥ (*ibid*. 12. 270, 1)

Here Nīlakaṇṭha says that this question is put forward by Yudhiṣṭhira for determining the course to be adopted by persons failing to traverse the difficult path to *mokṣa*,

"मोक्षधर्माननुष्ठातुमशक्तस्य त्रिवर्गे कः श्रेष्ठतम इति पृच्छति—धर्ममिति ।"

19. सुप्रसन्ना हि ते देवा यत्र धर्मे रता मतिः ।
धने सुखकला काचिद्धर्मे तु परमं सुखम् ॥ (*Mbh*. 12.270.56)

This is written on the basis of a series of lectures delivered in the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, Gol Park, Calcutta.

G. C. TRIPATHY, Allahabad :

ON THE DATE OF NILĀDRIMAHODAYA

With its 91 Adhyāyas and some 6,500 ślokas (mostly *anuṣṭubh*) the *Nīlādrimahodaya* (*NM*) is the most comprehensive Sanskrit work on the rites and rituals of Jagannātha Cult. It contains not only an extensive version of the legend of the foundation of *Puruṣottamakṣetra* (*i. e.* the so-called '*Indradyumna-legend*') in the first 6 Adhyāyas, but also the various daily, weekly and halfmonthly rites (*āhnika, sāptāhika* and *pākṣika nīti*) together with their injunctions and prohibitions in the adhyāyas 7 to 13, a detailed description of main annual festivals (*yātrās*) from Adh. 14 to 37 and then an elaborate account of daily *Pujā* of Jagannātha, Balabhadra and Subhadrā including details of *tarpaṇa* and homa etc. in the Adh. 38 to 90, The last Adhyāya it devoted to different *śānti*-and purifylng rites to be observed in the temple on the entrance of a Mohammedan (*yavana*) or impure animals and birds.

The *Nīlādrimahodaya* was first published in the year 1928 in Oriya script by the Rajā of Sonepur (printed at Utkal Sāhitya Press, Cuttack), and was distributed free of cost. The copies of this edition are now rarely available. Another welcome edition of this work in Devanāgarī script has recently (February, 1984) come out from Cuttack which has been edited and published by Shri Shridhar MAHAPATRA. This Devanāgarī edition will certainly go a long w ay in making the work known outside the frontiers of Orissa, to which it has remained confined till now.

To know the exact date of composition of such a significant work is obviously of paramount importance for the study of Jagannātha Cult. There has recently been two attempts to determine the date of this work. The one is by Bidyutlata RAI and the other by Shridhar MAHAPATRA. In her article on the *Nīlādrimahodaya* published in the *Vishveshwarananda Indological Journal* (Hoshiarpur 1982, Vol. XX, 1-2 pp. 75-76) Rai expresses the opinion that the *Nīlādrimahodaya* was composed in the "later part of the 14th century". Shri MAHAPATRA is also in favour of accepting a date prior to 1435 *A.D.* for the composition of this work[1].

1. ग्रन्थस्यास्य रचनाकालविषये निर्दिष्टोल्लेखप्रमाणानि नोपलभ्यन्ते। तथाप्यस्मिन् यवनप्रवेशजनित शुद्धिव्यवस्था निर्द्धारितास्ति इतिकृत्त ग्रन्थोऽयं १४३५ खीष्टकालात् प्रागेव प्रणीतो जात इति अनुमीयते ॥
See *NM*, Cuttack (Orissa), 1984 (p. ख of the भूमिका)

None of the two, however, seems to have thoroughly examined and analysed the internal evidences of the text in order to come to a definite conclusion. It is proposed to determine the date of *NM* in this article on the basis of internal evidences supplied by the text itself. Let us start with the examination of the title first. It may be observed that '*Mahodaya*' is a rather unusual word to be used as the title of a work describing the importance of a religious *kṣetra*, the works of this sort being usually designated as '*māhātmyas*'. The title '*Nīlādrimahodaya*' becomes even more interesting when we learn that there is a special annual '*Yātrā*' (*i. e.* festival) of this very name in the Jagannātha temple which takes place on the 10th day of the bright fortnight of the month *Vaiśākha*. This '*Nīlādrimahodaya*' *yātrā* which consists of only a ceremonial '*abhiṣeka*' of the Deities, is considered to be a 'secret' (*gupta*), *thirteenth* yātrā of the Temple because of the obvious reason that the older text like the *Puruṣottama Māhātmya* of *Skd. Pur.* always speaks of 12 *yātrās* only and never mentions the *yātrā* known as '*Nīlādrimahodaya*'. A valuable hint as to the origin of this *yātrā* is found in the '*Nīti*' text of the Jagannātha temple written in all probability during or just after the reign of Narasiṁha Deva of Khurdā dynasty (1622-1647 *A.D.*). While working for the Orissa Research Project in Bhubaneswar in the year 1971, I had procured a manuscript of this work from the-then *Deula Karaṇa* of Jagannātha Temple. This work mentions on Folio 16b that the '*Nīlādrimahodaya yātrā*' was started in the 27th *Aṁka* of Narasiṁha Deva (*i. e.* 1642 *A.D.*) when the '*parameśvara*' (meaning obviously Jagannātha) was brought back from *Bāṇapura* :

> *nīlādrimahodayajātrāku| śrīnarasiṁhadevaṭhākuraṁka*
> *27 aṁkare parameśvara bāṇapuraṭhārū bijekari āṇi*
> *phālguna śukla navamī dina nīlādrimahodaya hoilāku.........*

It is thus clear that this *yātrā* was introduced to commemorate a memorable event of the return of Lord Jagannātha to his temple in Puri. The word '*nīlādrimahodaya*' seen in this context becomes quite clear and it must mean here "the great rise (or re-appearance) on the *nīlādri* (of Lord Jagannātha)".

Of all the rulers of the Bhoi dynasty, the king Narasiṁha Deva is known to have introduced maximum number of reforms and innovations in the Temple. The Sanskrit *Mādalā Pāñjī* of India office library, London (known as '*Kaṭakarājavaṁśā-*) *valiḥ*')gives him credit of about a dozen of novel ideas (*cf.* Folio 48). But even this list does not seem to be exhaustive since it does not mention, for example, the most popular—though shortlived—innovation of Narasiṁha Deva, namely the second annual Car Festival in spring which is so beautifully described by the contemporary poet Haladhara Miśra in his *Vasantotsava-mahākāvyam*.

The *Mādalā Pāñjī* (Prāc[7] Ed.) mentions that in the 4th *Aṁka* of the king Narasiṁha Deva, Ahmed Beg, the Muslim governor of Orissa ordered the king to bring

his family to Cuttack. Narasiṁha Deva defied this order and leaving Khurdhā took shelter in the fort of Māṇatrī (on the outskirts of Raṇpur). Since a clash between the forces of Narasiṁha Deva and Ahmed Beg as well as an attack on the Jagannātha temple was now certain, the *Daitāpatis* took out the *'Brahmans'* from the wooden statues and wrapping it carefully in (their ?) clothes, they brought them to the fort of Maṇatrī where the king was staying :

> *a mahārājāṁka cari aṁke ahamadàbega boila kuṭumba rājaṁkara*
> *kaṭaka nia|ethaku rājā andhārī mahimaṭhārū māṇatrī*
> *kaṭakaku bije karigale|tati bhitaru parameśvaraṁkaṭhāru*
> *brahmamāne bāhara kari daitāpati lūgāre purāi māṇatrī*
> *kaṭake srīnaare bije karāi thile*|Pp. 66-67.

Within a year these *Brahmans* were secretly brought back from Māṇatrī and placed inside the wooden statues in the temple at Puri since Rājā Bhīma Siṁha, a Rajput General accompanying the troups of Prince Shah Jehan, then coming from south and passing through Orissa, wanted to have a *darśana* of Lord Jagannātha. When this Moghul Prince, however, fled from Patna through Orissa to South, the statues were removed to Khurdhā and were kept there in a mud-house (*meradā*) for a shortwhile, to be brought back finally to Puri when Shah Jehan disappeared. According to *Mādalā Pāñjī* this happened in the 12th *Aṁka* of Narasiṁha Deva (p. 67) but K. N. MAHAPATRA, examining the evidences of the Muslim historical records, rightly remarks that it should actually be the 7th *Aṁka* of the *Gajapati* and that some error has crept in the reckoning of *Mādalā Pāñjī*.

After the re-installation of the Jagannātha statues in the 7th *Aṁka* of *Gajapati* Narasiṁha Deva (1625-26 *A. D.*), no further attack was led on the Jagannātha temple for about 67 years (*i. e.* till the time of Divya Siṁha Deva in 1692) by the Muslim Subedars of Cuttack which gave opportunity to Narasiṁha Deva to devote his attention to the Jagannātha temple for about 21 years (*i. e.* till his murder in 1647) and introduce many desirable changes in the services *etc.* He also plastered the whole temple in 1636-37 *A. D.* It is thus most likely that the information rendered by the old *'Nīti'* text is reliable and a new *'yātrā,'* the thirteenth one known as *'nīlādrimahodaya'*—the great rise on (or, of) *Nīlādri*, was initiated by the king Narasiṁha Deva in order to commemorate the event of re-installation of the Deities in the temple which must have been done by putting the *'Brahma-padārtha'* in the newly fashioned images under the observance of different rites of the ceremony of *'Navakalevara'*. This was the event which made the expression *'nīlādrimahodaya'* popular which our author accepted as the title of his stupendous work on Jagannātha cult, though he might have meant it to be understood as meaning 'the greatness' or 'the importance' of Blue Mountain or the Jagannātha temple in Puri.

The work *Nīlādrimahodaya* cannot have been written, I believe, before the event '*nīlādrimahodaya*' took place (*i. e.* before 1626 *A.D.*), and, in fact, on the basis of a few internal evidences, it seems to have been written even much later, namely after the beginning of the Maratha influence in Orissa (*i. e.* after about 1740 *A.D.*).

The strongest argument in support of this proposition is the mention in *Nīlādrimahodaya* of the '*Gaṇeśa*'—(or *Hāthi-*) *Veśa*', *i. e.* the ceremony of dressing Jagannātha and Baladeva as the god Gaṇeśa which takes place just after the famous bath-ceremony on *Jyeṣṭhā-pūrṇimā*. *Nīlādrimahodaya* 14.84, 85ab (page 136 of oriya ed. reads as follows :

harau samarpya mālyaiśca nānāpuṣpakulodbhavaiḥ |
kariśreṣṭhākṛtitayā veśam ca kārayet tadā ||
etādṛśam balasyāpi veśam kuryān nṛpottama |

It is obvious that '*kariśreṣṭhākṛti*' cannot mean anything else but the *veśa* of *Gaṇeśa* with which Jagannātha and Baladeva are dressed in order to get identifed with Gaṇeśa.

There are some 20 different *veśas* of Jagannātha which are put on him at different occasions either to commemorate a certain special event from the legend of Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa (*e. g. Kāliyamardana-veśa, Vanabhoja-veśa, Rādhādāmodara-veśa*) or Viṣṇu (*Gajoddhāraṇa-veśa, Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa-veśa etc.*) or else to represent the different incarnations (*e. g. Vāmana-veśa, Nṛsiṁha-veśa*) or aspects (*Nāgārjuna-veśa, Rājādhirāja-veśa*) of Viṣṇu-Jagannātha. Among these the *Gaṇeśa veśa* is unique in many ways. First of all it is the only *Veśa* with which Jagannātha is identified with a totally different god lying outside the pale of Viṣṇuism. There is no similar *Veśa*, in other words, to identify Jagannātha with Śiva, Sūrya or Indra *etc.* Secondly it is not observed on a day which is auspicious to Gaṇeśa, *e. g. Gaṇeśa-caturthī*, which is the normal rule with the different *veśas*. The *Vāmana-veśa*, for example, is put on Lord Jagannātha on the *Vāmanadvādaśī* and *Nṛsiṁha-veśa* on *Nṛsiṁha-caturdaśī* but the *Jyeṣṭhapūrṇimā* on which the *Gaṇeśa-veśa* is performed has absolutely no connection with the worship of Gaṇeśa. Thirdly the arrangements for performing this *veśa* are not made by the Temple, nor the costs borne by it, as is the case with other *veśas*, Instead, these arrangements are made by two Maṭhas of Puri namely the Gopālatīrtha and the Rāghavadāsa (originally only Gopālatīrtha was responsible for it.)

All these facts taken together indicate that the *Gaṇeśa-veśa* was not a part of the traditional '*nīti*' of the Temple, but has been introduced later. This seems to be corroborated by the fact that neither the ancient Nīti-text of the *Deula Karaṇa* (*ca.* 1650 *A. D.*) nor the *Yātrā-tattvam* of Raghunandana (first half of 17th century) mention it. The oldest reference to *Gaṇeśa-veṣa* occurs in the second part of an extremely

popular Oriya work named *Dārḍhyatā Bhakti* describing the life stories of the Vaiṣṇava bhaktas and written during the Maratha rule in Orissa (Pt. I finished in 1768 *A. D.* and Pt. II in 1800 *A. D.*). The story narrated in *Dārḍhyatā Bhakti* runs as follows : Once a Brahmin named Gaṇapati Bhaṭṭa belonging to the village Kaniyārī in Karnataka and whose *Iṣṭadevatā* was only Gaṇeśa came to Puri to see the *'snāna-yātrā'* festival of Lord Jagannātha. He would bow to none other god except Gaṇeśa and was not prepared to accept Jagannātha as the Lord of the world since he did not look like Gaṇeśa. Lord Jagannātha was so pleased with his single-minded devotion to his *Iṣṭadeva* Gaṇeśa that He manifested Himself as Gaṇeśa to him, thus underlining his ultimate identity with all the gods and granted a boon that the people would be able to see Him as Gaṇeśa on this day every year.

The historical facts underlying this anecdote are quite apparent. Of all the people in India the Maharastrians are perhaps most devoted to Gaṇeśa. It were they who introduced the *Gaṇeśa veśa* for Jagannātha and Baladeva and entrusted this task to a Maṭha which they must have endowed with land *etc.* to finance this *veśa*. Perhaps some difficulties were felt in introducing this untraditional *veśa* in the regular *'nīti'* of the temple. It could not be prescribed for any ceremony inside the temple but was relegated to an occasion when the Deities are, as such, outside the temple and there too it was to be observed more or less as a formality devoid of any religious context.

The Marathas occupied Orissa in 1751 *A. D.* (year of the treaty between Raghuji Bhonsale and Alivardi Khan acc. to which Orissa was ceded to the Marathas). But they had involved themselves in the politics of Orissa already about a decade ago. Maratha army was present in Orissa during this time and fought many battles with the Muslim army of Cuttack against Alivardi Khan, the Nazim of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa.[2] In 1761 the Marathas took over the administrative control of the areas surrounding the *Puruṣottama-kṣetra*, and also more or less managed the affairs of the Temple. Even if the *Gaṇeśa-veśa* has been introduced in the early years of the presence of Marathas in Orissa, say around 1750 *A.D.*, we must postulate the period 1755-60 *A.D.* as the anterior most limit for the composition of *Nīlādri-mahodaya*.

The *Nīlādri-mahodaya* mentions in its 13th Adhyāya the rites which are to be observed when a *yavana* (—Mohammedan) crosses the threshold of the temple. The entrance of *yavanas* into the temple, according to *NM*, results in the mental derrangement of the King, his premature death and collapse of political power in that country .

yadā pramādād bhavane pāvane ca hareḥ kvacit|
prāsādadehalīm nīco yavano yadi laṁghayet||
tadā bhaven mahādoṣaḥ kṣīṇāyur nṛpatir bhavet|
*cittabhramo'pi nṛpater deśabhaṁgo bhavet tadā||*13.3,4 (Oriya Ed.)

2. *cf.* H, K. MAHATAB, *History of Orissa*, vol. II (1960), p. 405

In *NM* 7.110 (Page 83 of Oriya ed.) there is mention of the language of the *yavanas* (obviously Persian) which, if spoken near the *naivedya* is to be discarded and buried in a ditch :

yāvanīyakathā jātā naivedyanikaṭe yadi|

*tan naivedyam bahiṣkṛtya dīrghakhāte nipātayet||*7.110 (Oriya ed.)

These passages seem to reflect contemporary social and political conditions. We learn from *Mādalā Pāñjī* that during the time of Divyasiṁha Deva in May, 1692 Aurangazeb, the Moghul ruler of Delhi, ordered Ekram Khan, the Subedar of Orissa, to pull down the temple of Jagannātha. When Divyasiṁha Deva found himself unable to resist the Mohammedans, he offered to break the temple himself in order to get some time to bring the worshipable images to a secret place within the temple compound (*i.e.* behind the temple of Vimalā) as well as to exchange the real image of Jagannātha against a forged one made of sandal wood and studded with two jewels in place of eyes which was then handed over to the Mohammedans. A portion of the Lion's Gate was broken and some Mohammedans entered into the Temple. One of them, (mentioned as) Mir Sayed Mahmud in some records, the brother (or a soldier ?) of Ekram Khan, climbed up on the *Ratnasiṁhāsana* (*Mādalā Pāñjī*, Prācī Ed. p. 70-71).

This was perhaps the first (and the last) instance after the re-installation of the Jagannātha images (in 1590 *A.D.*) when a Mohammedan could climb up on the holy padestal of the Deities and due to the presence of one or more Mohammedans in the sanctum talking the *yavana*-language, the whole *naivedya* was polluted. It seems to me likely that the author of *Nīlādrimahodaya*, a *Pūjāpaṇḍā* himself, might have had the sad experience of seeing the *yavanas* crossing the threshhold of the temple and of hearing the Persian language inside the temple compound in his early life. It is a piece of personal reminiscence what we have here and with this reminiscence is joined an instruction to the ruling king that "he should always remain on alert (never let it happen again) and as soon as he hears that the *yavanas* have dared to enter the Temple, he should spare no time to punish those who deserve punishment" :

praveśam yavanānāṁ ca śrutvā rājā sasatvaraḥ |

daṇḍyānām daṇḍado bhūyāt sāvadhāno bhavet tadā ||

13.5. (Page 126)

This is an instruction which, if it were not to remain a dream or a pious wish, could be carried out only under a powerful Hindu rule. If we psychologically analyse this *Selbstverständlichkeit* of the author with which he recommends the punishment of the intruding Mohammedans and takes it for granted that it could be carried out as a matter of course by the ruling king, we shall certainly come to the conclusion that the

author wrote these lines after the Maratha rule in Orissa had already started. Can the reference to the 'mental derrangement' of a king in Śl.13.4 quoted above, be interpreted as having an indirect reference to Vīrakeśarī Deva who went mad in 1779 *A. D.* and killed his four sons ? We do not know. It looks unlikely especially because this derrangement cannot be brought in connection with any intrusion of *Yavanas* in the temple. Still the similarity of the historical events with the description of *NM* is rather striking.

It is necessary to make here a passing reference to an Oriya work called *Nīlādrimahodaya* (published by Govindaratha Pustakalaya, Cuttack; no date) by the poet Mahādeba Dāsa, who has earned an honourable place for himself in the galaxy of Oriya poets by writing such significant purāṇic works as *Viṣṇu-keśarī-Purāṇa*, *Padma-Purāṇa*, *Śiva-Purāṇa* and *Mārkaṇḍa-Purāṇa etc*. The literary activity of this poet is ascribed to the period of Divyasiṁha Deva (roughly from 1700 *A.D.* to 1730 *A.D.*) by K. N. Mahapatra in his *Khurddhā Itihāsa* on the most plausible ground that the poet Pitāmbara Dāsa, who finished the first *Ratnākara* of his *Nṛsiṁha Purāṇa* in 1762 *A. D.* mentions in the second *Ratnākara* of this work that he had been Mahādeva Dāsa in his previous (*i. e.* sixth) birth ("*ṣaṣṭha janme mahādeba dāsa heli mūhi|viṣṇukeśari je viṣṇupurāṇaku likhi...*," P.235 of the edition of Radharamana Pustakalaya, Cuttack) which shows that Mahādeba Dāsa belonged to the previous generation of Pītāmbara Dāsa and that he was dead before the latter was born.

Now, if this Oriya *Nīlādrimahodaya* had any connections with the Sanskrit *Nīlādrimahodaya*, it would have been very important to us, especially in view of fixing the date of the latter. One might even argue that the title of the Oriya work was suggested by the Sanskrit original, as is the case with other works of Mahādeba Dāsa. But, in fact the *Oriya Nīlādrimahodaya* is an almost exact paraphrase, in verses, of the *Puruṣottama-māhātmya* of *Skanda-Purāṇa* and does not show any acquaintance with the Sanskrit *Nīlādrimahodaya*. Even the number and contents of the Adhyāyas tally with those of Sanskrit *Puruṣottama-Māhātmya* and the colophone of this so called '*Nīlādrimahodaya*' reads in the end of every Adhyāya as follows :

iti śrīskandapurāṇe vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍe caturaśīti-
sahasre śrīpuruṣottamamāhātmye indradyumnadvādaśa-
yātrākaraṇakathane brahmalokaprāptau pañcacatvāriṁśo'dhyāyaḥ|

But down later in the brackets is then mentioned "*samāpto'yaṁ nīlādrimahodayanāmā granthaḥ*".

It is obvious that the poet understood his work to be more or less an Oriya re-narration of Sanskrit *Puruṣottama-māhātmya*. The work ended for him with the colophone ("...adhyāyaḥ). The designation of this work as '*nīlādrimahodaya*' is of

later origin, *i. e.* of the period when Sanskrit *Nīlādri-mahodaya* had become sufficiently popular, perhaps even more popular than the title *'Puruṣottama-māhātmya'* itself. The poet probably wanted to give his work a slightly changed title which is mentioned on the last-but-one page (191) of the said edition; namely *"Puruṣottama-carita"*. The so called *'Nīlādrimahodaya'* of Oriya thus does not alter in any way our findings regarding the possible date of the composition of Sanskrit *Nīlādrimahodaya*.

The above investigations clearly prove that there are massive evidences to assume that the *Nīlādrimahodaya* was composed most probably during the third quarter of the 18th century (*i. e.* between 1750 and 1775 *A.D.*). There is absolutely no justification to date this work in the 14th century of Christian era. The statement of L. PANDA, Special Officer appointed to record the Rituals and conventions *etc.* of the Temple under the Orissa Govt.'s Jagannātha Temple act, on P.30 of his report about the date of *Nīlādrimahodaya* ("towards the end of the 18th century"), which is probably based on earlier references to this work by the British Officials of the early 19th century, stands on firm, rocky foundation.

J. L. Brockington, Edinburgh :

VṚṢADAṀŚA / PṚṢADAṀŚAKA

Professor A. C. Swain has been a distinguished head of the Sanskrit Department at Utkal University and I am pleased to maintain my contact with his department by contributing to this Felicitation Volume and to wish him well on this occasion.

The lexica are unanimous in including *vṛṣadaṁśa* among the synonyms for "cat". For example, Amarasiṁha lists *otur bilālo mārjāro vṛṣadaṁśaka ākhubhuk* at *Amarakośa* 2.5.6ab, on which Kṣīrasvāmin in his *Amarakośodghātana* provides the etymology : *vṛṣān ākhūn daśati vṛṣadaṁśaḥ.*[1] Although this etymology implies the spelling *vṛṣadaṁśa* (*ka*), in fact there seems to be at least some manuscript support whenever the word occurs for an alternative spelling *pṛṣadaṁśa* (*ka*), which invites the speculation that the name might have something to do with the animal's spotted appearance. The employment or not of the-*ka* suffix appears to be completely random, as the discrepancy between Amarasiṁha and Kṣīrasvāmin already suggests, as well as that between Halāyudha's nearly identical line *otur viḍālo mārjāro vṛṣadaṁśaś ca kathyate* (*Abhidhānaratnamālā* 2. 81 ab) and Hemacandra's similar *viḍāla otur mārjāro hrīkuś ca vṛṣadaṁśakaḥ* (*Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* 1301 cd)[2]

However, I was led to question this meaning of the word by consideration of its sole occurrence in the *Rāmāyaṇa.*[3] One factor was simply that this was its sole occurrence and the other was the interpretation of the term in later tradition. Two other terms for cat from Amarasiṁha's list of synonyms are found in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, of which *mārjāra* (4.2.11c, 26.3b, 5.21.9d, 6.26.27a, 7.7.20b and c, also in † passages) is the commoner, while *biḍāla* occurs only twice (at 2.106.2a, where *mārjāra* is read in most N. mss., and 3.45.41c, also in † passages). I have argued elsewhere that in the *Rāmāyaṇa* cats are invariably wild.[4] There is thus no natural link between cities and cats; indeed, one of the signs of Ayodhyā's desolation is the presence of cats and owls (2.106.2). When, therefore, Hanumān on entering Laṁkā to reconnoitre becomes the size of a *pṛṣadaṁśaka* (*pṛṣadaṁśakomātraḥ san babhūvādbhutadarśanaḥ*, 5.2.46 ef), the use of the otherwise unexampled term might be thought to indicate a different creature. Nevertheless, the commentators are unanimous in understanding it as a cat, quoting Amarasiṁha's line or giving the etymology that we have already noted from Kṣīrasvāmin. On the other hand, when we look at this episode in later versions of the

Rāmāyaṇa, a different picture emerges. Hanumān's change of size (and presumably also appearance) is omitted altogether in the earliest retelling, the *Rāmopākhyāna*; Kamban and the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* refer only to his assuming a minute form; Bhaṭṭi says that he assumed the size of a hare, in Guṇabhadra's *Uttarapurāṇa* he has the form of a bee, in Tulsīdās' *Rāmcaritmānas* he is like a gnat and in the Thai *Rāmakīen* he is as small as a beetle. From these descriptions the most striking point is the minuteness of the form Hanumān adopted (which is obviously an aid to eluding detection), while several make it that of an insect of some sort.

The Vedic occurrences of the term are not very helpful in determining its meaning. The main instance is in the list of victims for the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice given in the *Yajurveda*, where the very miscellaneous character of the animals named does not permit any inference about the nature of the *vṛṣadaṁśa* except that it is presumably a wild animal, since it occurs in that part of the list. Thus it occurs at *TS* 5.5.12/*MS* 3.14.12/*VS* 24.31 along with the *ūla* (?owl), and *halīkṣṇa* (? lion) as assigned to Dhātṛ. At *TS* 5.5.21 the goose (*haṁsa*),wolf (*vṛka*) and *vṛṣadaṁśa* belong to Indra.[5] In the *Brāhmaṇas* we read that Kaṇva heard a *vṛṣadaṁśa* sneeze or cough "*āṣ*" (*Pañcaviṁśa Br*. 8.2.2 *kaṇvo......vṛṣadaṁśasyāṣ iti kṣuvatā upāśṛṇot*; *Jaiminīya Br*. 3.46 has *pṛṣadaṁśa*), which is not usual noise for a cat. A similar term, *vṛṣadatī*, occurs in the *Atharvaveda* (*AVŚ* 1.18.4; *AVP* 20.18.1) where GELDNER takes the hymn as relating to a domestic cat, whereas WHITNEY translates *vṛṣadatī* as bull-toothed" and considers that this verse lists various unlucky signs or the women marked with them. This passage is mainly significant in giving support to the alternative interpretation of *vṛṣadaṁśa* as meaning "having a strong bite", which has inherently greater probability, since *vṛṣa* in the sense of a mouse is found only in the lexica.

While the Vedic literature is the obvious starting point in any philological enquiry, the *Mahābhārata* may perhaps shed more light on the *Rāmāyaṇa* occurrence, because of their common epic background. Certainly, comparison with the *Mahābhārata* raises doubts about the synonymity of *vṛṣadaṁśa* with either *biḍāla* or *mārjāra*.[6] At *Mbh*. 9.43.25 *vṛṣadaṁśamukha* occurs in the next *pāda* to *biḍālamakarānana*, which implies their distinctness although Varadarāja here glosses *vṛṣadaṁśo vanamārjāraḥ*. Similarly, in the next *adhyāya*, in a similar list of fearsome looking creatures, *vṛṣadaṁśamukha* (9.44.79d) comes not long after *mārjāraśaśavaktra* (76a). Again, *vṛṣadaṁśamukhā iva* at *Mbh*. 12.102.17d occurs at no great remove from *biḍālakubjāstanavaḥ* at 10a. In all three passages the presumption must be that the items listed are distinct.

Among the portents that Vyāsa describes to Dhṛtarāṣṭra is the clamour of a boar and a *vṛṣadaṁśa* fighting together (*antarikṣe varāhasya vṛṣadaṁśasya cobhayoḥ/ praṇādam yudhyato rātrau raudraṁ nityaṁ pralakṣaye Mbh*. 6.2.25). We should expect a somewhat larger animal than a cat, even a wild cat, as opponent of a boar. Larger size would also be more appropriate to a fur-bearing animal, for at *Mbh*. 2.47.3athe skins

of these along with those of *eḍa* sheep (*edāṁś cailān vārṣadṁśān*) are brought as tribute by the Kāmbojas to the Pāṇḍavas;[7] does this passage also indicate that the animal was specific to the Northwest ?[8] Less decisive but still probably indicative of an imposing nature is the verse *tataś cakampe vasudhā śakrāśanisamāhitā / nanādāntarhito bhūmau vṛṣadaṁśo jagarja ca* at *Hv.* 106.41, despite Nīlakaṇṭha's gloss *vṛṣadaṁśaḥ biḍālaḥ*; however, we may note that again the animal is credited with an unfeline noise, since roaring is entirely different from a cat's mewing or purring and much more in keeping with a larger animal.

Varahamihira too appears to consider the *vṛṣadaṁśa* a large, skin or fur producing animal when as part of the *pusyasnāna* the king is to sit on various skins, listed as *vṛṣasya vṛṣadaṁśasya ruroś ca pṛṣatasya ca / teṣām upari siṁhasya vyāghrasya ca tataḥ param* (*Bṛhatsaṁhitā* 48.76), for the other animals mentioned are all of a fair size. It is possible that he has chosen the name merely for its alliteration with *vṛṣa* and *pṛṣata*, although the presence of the *ruru* in the middle lessens the force of this possible objection. It is also possible that the juxtaposition of *vṛṣa* and *vṛṣadaṁśa* means that Varāhamihira took the latter in the sense of "bull-biting" but if so we should expect it to belong with the lion and tiger in the second line.

Whereas Varahamihira in the sixth century belongs after the period of growth of the epics, the *Suśrutasaṁhitā* falls into about the middle of that period. It is therefore the more interesting that in it a distinction is clearly implied between *mārjāra* (listed along with lion, tiger, wolf, hyena, bear, panther, jackal, deer and *irvāruka* as living-in lairs, *guhāśaya*; at 1.46.72) and *vṛṣadaṁśa* (listed along with porcupine, monitor and a variety of other animals as living in the holes, *bileśaya*, at 1.46.78); unfortunately, while Suśruta comments on the qualities of the flesh of various individual animals, as well as the groups, in this whole section on diet, he does not single out either *mārjāra* or *vṛṣadaṁśa* for particular mention and so does not give any real clue to their respective identity.

It is only when we come on to so late a text as Viśvanātha's *Sāhityadarpaṇa* of the fourteenth century that we find a passage for which the lexical meaning of "cat" is appropriate, but it is quite probable that Viśvanātha, or the author being quoted, is relying on them. The verse is :

kṣipasi śukaṁ vṛṣadaṁśakaradane/
mṛgam arpayasi mṛgādanavadane //
vitarasi turagaṁ mahiṣaviṣāṇe /
nidadhac ceto bhogavitāne // *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, bk. 10. sect. 699 fin.).

Here the ascending scale of both victim and predator means that the *vṛṣadaṁśa* is smaller than the hyena (lit. "deer-eater", *mṛgāda* and so makes the meaning "cat" plausible.

That definite support in other literature for the meaning given by the lexica is so late in appearing must in itself cast some doubt on their listing of *vṛṣadaṁśa* as a term for "cat". What, however, its real meaning was is less easy to establish. From the Vedic evidence no more can be ascertained than that it was a wild animal, of sufficient size and importance to be included among the large variety of animals sacrificed during the *aśvamedha*. The *Rāmāyaṇa* passage from which I started implies, however, that it is either relatively small in size or in some other way insignificant (such as by being so common within towns as not to be remarked on, like the sparrow among birds) and this is at variance with the other evidence. The occurrences in the *Mahābhārata* suggest that the *vṛṣadaṁśa* is not only distinct from *biḍāla* and *mārjāra* but is an animal of fair size at least and of generally fearsome or menacing appearance, as well as being a source of fur or skins, to which the *Harivaṁśa* adds a roar as its cry. Both Suśruta and Varāhamihira in their mentions of the animal lend support to various parts of this picture. Such an animal would readily justify the etymology of the term as "having bull-like, *i.e.* strong, teeth" which seems more appropriate to an animal like a lion or tiger rather than a wild cat. Possibly, indeed, it was another member of the cat family which, if the link with the Kāmbojas has any particular significance, was less common in the rest of India.

There is still the problem of the *Rāmāyaṇa* passage. I am tempted to suggest that the alternation between *vṛṣadaṁśa* and *pṛṣadaṁśa* is a relic of the coalescence of two originally separate terms and that we therefore may have to do with two separate animals. For *pṛṣadaṁśa* the etymology "having spotted sides" is fairly obvious and might readily be applied to an insect (even possibly a bee) such as some later adaptations of the *Rāmāyaṇa* seem to indicate for the passage in question. What is still obscure is why either creature, if indeed there are two, came to be identified as a cat. We may however conjecture that an early lexicon had a list of predators or of carnivorous animals, which included both *mārjāra* (or *biḍāla*) and *vṛṣadaṁśa* along with others such as lion and tiger, from which a later lexicographer extracted *mārjāra/biḍāla* and *vṛṣadaṁśa* as exact synonyms in constructing his own lists. Perhaps the likeliest possibility is that the *vṛṣadaṁśa* (in most occurrences) is a larger feline of about the size of a leopard; if the one link with the Northwest is significant, then the snow leopard, *Panthera uncia* (Schrebar), or the lynx, *Felis lynx isabellina* Blyth, might even be considered.

NOTES

1. So too Hemacandra in his *Haimadhātupārāyaṇa* under *daṁśaṁ daśane* (1.496) includes *vṛṣaṁ mūṣikaṁ daśati vṛṣadaṁśo viḍālaḥ* and Mahendra in his commentary on Hemacandra's *Anekārthasaṁgraha* 2.558 (*vṛṣo gavyākhudharmayoḥ*) glosses *ākhau nirjantau vṛṣadaṁśa eṣa kurute.*

2. To these could be added the occurrence in the *Medinīkośa* 28.133ab : *viḍālo netra-piṇḍe syād vṛṣadaṁśakake pumān*. European dictionaries seem to have taken over the meaning "cat" from the indigenous lexica without further investigation.

3. By this I mean its sole occurrence in the text of the Critical Edition of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. There is one instance in a passage found in a single manuscript which does support the traditional meaning : *na bhayaṁ vidyate cātra mṛgaiḥ siṁhāḥ samāgatāḥ| ākhavo vṛṣadaṁśaiś ca miṣṭaṁte caikatāṁ gatāḥ* (*Rām*. 3.106*† 1-2).

4. See my *Righteous Rāma* (Delhi, 1984), pp.90-1.

5. The Vedic commentators here gloss the term as "cat", *e. g*. Mādhava on *TS* 5.5.12 has *vṛṣadaṁśo mārjāraḥ tatsadṛśa ityeke* and on *TS* 5.5.21 *vṛṣadaṁśa mārjālasad-ṛśaḥ*, while Mahīdhara on *VS* 24.31 has *vṛṣadaṁśo viḍālaḥ* Mādhava's caution is to be noted.

6. The two terms *biḍāla* and *mārjāra* occur with much the same frequency in most of the *Mahābhārata*. The major exception is in the dialogue of the cat and the mouse (*Mbh*. 12.136), where *mārjāra* is standardly used and *biḍāla* occurs only once in the final verse of the narrative, which is quite possibly a latter addition. Such use of a specific range of vocabulary and preference for one synonym over another is of course characteristic of an individual author's natural speech.

7. Against this inference should be set the fact that on the v, l. *bailan* for *cailan* both Devabodha and Nīlakaṇṭha gloss *bilavāsimuṣikādiromajān* and so envisage the possibility of quite small animals.

8. It may be noted that *Vṛṣadaṁśa* as the name of a mountain seen by Arjuna when he is taken up by Kṛṣṇa is located in the north (*Mbh*. 7.57.29a, *cf*. 23ab). There is some discussion of the formation of *vārṣadaṁśa* by Ujjvaladatta in his *vṛtti* on *Uṇādisūtra* 5.21; *pṛṣadaṁśa* is included in the *gaṇa utsādi* (Pāṇ.4.1.86); *cf*. also *Pāṇinīya Gaṇapāṭha* 4.1.86, *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya* 16.19 and *Atharva Pariśiṣṭa* 16.19.

Sadashiv A. DANGE, Bombay :

PURĀṆA AND THE PAURĀṆIKA

In the development of the Hindu religion the *Purāṇa* has unique importance ; and the traditon of the *Purāṇas* extol them as being on equal footing in comparison with the Vedic texts. It is interesting to see the the background of the spread of the *Purāṇa*-texts.

Writing of the *Purāṇa* texts obtains as a holy act. It is enjoined that the starting of the copying of a *Purāṇa*-manuscript should be done with the drawing of a circle or a *svastika*. On it there should be arranged leaves of *śara* (stalks used for making arrows; cane). The writer should face the east. He should copy five verses, and then should contemplate on a bed of lotuses. Prior to this he is enjoined to bow to the preceptor, who, in his turn, bows down to the goddess of learning, Sarasvatī. He also bows down to a figure of Hari arranged from letters, and the *Purāṇa* itself, from which he is to copy. Ink may be put in a silver-pot, or one made from gold. The pen may, preferably, be a golden one. The script is mentioned to be *Nāgara*.[1] After these preliminaries he is to feed his preceptor and brahmins. Then he should start writing (or copying) regularly. When the script is complete it is enjoined to be placed on an auspicious seat (*bhadrāsane*) to the north-eastern quarter, where decorative designs are drawn.

The script is believed to be endowed with life; and, as such, a ritual detail to that effect has to be gone through, it being called *sajīvīkaraṇa*. It comprises the smelling of *caru* (pot of boiled rice) specially cooked for the occasion. An important detail is the bath of the manuscript. This is done by giving bath to the image of the manuscript reflected in a mirror, by sprinkling it with holy water from various vessels[2]. Then follows the taking round of the manuscript round the city in a chariot or on the back of an elephant. Then it is to be deposited in the house, or in a temple[3].

The *Purāṇa* texts multiplied in a unique method, as virtue was associated with the gift of a *Purāṇa* text. Those who could not themselves write got the text written and donated for them. It is enjoined on the person who got it written for him that he should sprinkle it as reflected in the mirror till a whole chapter is written (copied)[4]. Then it was donated to a brahmin. Various months are ordained for the gifts of different *Purāṇa*-scripts. According to the *Kūrma P.* (II. 44. 124-126)

this *Purāṇa* is to be completed and given to a brahmin, or deposited in a temple, in *Vaiśākha*. It says that by doing so, the donor gets his next birth in the family of brahmins,[5] which would indicate that the brahmin donor ensured his brahmin-birth by so donating, and those of the other *varṇas* would get a promotion ! The *Padma P.* is enjoined to be so donated on the full-moon-day of *Vaiśākha*, along with a 'water-cow'[6] ; or, it may also be donated in the month *Jyeṣṭha*, along with a golden lotus.[7] The *Viṣṇu* P. is enjoined to be donated on the full-moon-day of *Jyeṣṭha*, the *Vāyu P.* on the full-moon-day of *Śrāvaṇa* and the *Bhāgavata P.* on the same day in *Prauṣṭhapada*—, which is *Bhādrapada*—(*Skanda P.* VII. 1.2.29-41). In the same way, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Bhaviṣya P.* are enjoined to be donated in the Sun-temple or to a *brāhmaṇa*.[8] Even parts of the manuscripts are enjoined to be so donated for the gain of virtue,[9] It is stated that at the *Vyāsa tīrtha*, at *Dīpeśvara* on the bank of the Narmadā, one should give away such a manuscript, along with his daughter. It is also said that a person who causes the praise of the Narmadā written and donates it at this *tīrtha* gains the virtue of a bath in the sacred river Narmadā.[10] The practice is that the manuscript has to be accompanied by some other gift. The *Agni P.* (272.2ff.) gives a list of such gifts *Purāṇa-wise*. Thus, *Viṣṇu P.* with a *jaladhenu*; *Vāyu P.* with a *guḍa-dhenu*: the *Bhāgavata P.* with a golden lion; the *Nārada P.*, with a cow in *Āśvina*; the *Varāha P.* with a golden eagle; the *Kūrmā P.* with a golden tortoise; the *Matsya P.* with a golden fish; the *Garuḍa P.* with a golden swan *etc.*

The reading (or causing to read) a *Purāṇa* text for the atonement of sins, or on the gain of some thing, appears as a custom. The usual period is week, and the most popular *Purāṇa* is the *Bhāgavata*. Thus, according to the *Padma P.* (*Uttara* 193.34-42) Dhundhukārī was advised by Gokarṇa on the advice of the sun-god, to perform a *saptāha* ("seven-day" reading session) of the *Bhāgavata P.* The *saptāha* is said to be as important as the Vedic sacrificial session, which would clearly show growth of the Purāṇa-cult on the lines of the Vedic ritualism (Ib. 192.51f). Unlike the Vedic sessions (the *Pāriplava* included), these *sapt'has* were for the implicit participation of the common masses, women and even the lower-status people.[11] The arrangement at these *saptāhas* is enjoined to be like that at a marriage (Ib. 194.2 *vivāhe yathā vittam......*). Special residential arrangements are spoken of in connection with the *saptāha* (Ib. 14 *āgantukānām sarveṣām vāsasthānāni kalpayet*). As an alternative, the *saptāha* could be arranged at a place of pilgrimage, or in a forest (Ib.). People attending the *saptāha* are expected to be under strict discipline, which includes celibacy, sleeping on the ground and taking food in plates made from the arrangement of leaves. The reading is said to start at the break of the day and continue till the end of the third part of the day, with a break at noon for meals (Ib. 40-41)

The *Purāṇas* say that the reader of the *Purāṇa*, the *Paurāṇika*, should be well versed in the *Purāṇas*. He is enjoined to face the north, while the audience is to face

the east (Ib.24). By the side of the reader there is to be another person to explain the difficult passages and ideas in the *Purāṇa* text being read. On the day previous to the start of the *saptāha* the *Paurāṇika* is to have his head tonsured (Ib.25). On the first day the *Paurāṇika* and the manuscript are to be worshipped (Ib.29.2.3-26). The seat of the *Paurāṇika* is called *Dharmāsana* ("The seat of duty"). He is not to bow to anybody after he takes his seat on the "*Dharmāsana*." He is also called Vyāsa and the seat *Vyāsāsana* (*Skanda* P. III.3.22.25). The *Paurāṇika* is ordained to be a *brāhmaṇa* of the same seat as of the person who would arrange the *saptāha*; he should be without any deformity (*Skanda* P.II.2.2.49ff). The audience is to sit before him, but on a lower plane (Ib.). The completion of a chapter is said to be marked by the clappings by hand on the part of the audience (Ib.24 *karatālādikaiḥ...*) and the words "victory to Kṛṣṇa, Lord of the Universe" (Ib. *jaya kṛṣṇa jagannātha*).

There are restrictions for the audience, while hearing the *Purāṇa*, which include not chewing a *tāmbūla* (betel-leaves). It is also said that they should not wear their turbans on their heads.[12] According to the *Skanda* P. (II.7.21. 5-19) Rocana, a brāhmaṇa in Prayāga, once attended the session having his turban on and chewing the betel-leaves. The result was that, in the next birth, he was born as a terrible serpent.

All things offered during the *saptāha* are said to be the property of the *Paurāṇika*, who is equalled to god himself, or the preceptor (*guru*; *Bhaviṣya P. Brahmakhaṇḍa* 116.124). The *Paurāṇika* is called also "knower of *itihāsa*"; and the gifts given to him include sandal, white wreaths, silk-garmnets, a cow, a sacrificial thread prepared from gold, a white horse, an umbrella; also an excellent swing and a golden elephant (or cobra, *nāgaḥ*)

NOTES

1. *Agni* P. 63.13-15; cf. 15

   prāṅmukhaḥ padminīṁ dhyāyet likhitvā ślokapañcakam |
   raupyastha maṣyā hemyā ca lekhanyā nāgarākṣaram ||

2. Ib.17 *darpaṇe pustkam dhṛtvā secayet pūrvavad ghaṭaiḥ |*

3. Ib.20 *rathena hastinā vā'pi bhrāmayet pustkám naraiḥ |*
   gṛhe devālayādau tu pustakam sthāpya pūjayet. ||

4. Ib.22;cf. the bath to the image of Viṣṇu at Puri, reflected in a mirror, *Skanda* P.II.2.44.8 *ādarśa-pratibimbitam puruṣottamam*

5. *Kūrma* P.II.44.126 *viprāṇām jāyate kule*

6. *jaladhenu*; the word *dhenu* applied to many objects in the context of gifts indicates "small quantity" in many cases.

7. *Skanda* P.VII.1.2.29-31

8. *Bhav.P. Brāhmakhaṇḍa* 93.68-70

9. *Padma P. Brahmakhaṇḍa* 1.16; and to keep death away, *tasya gṛhasamīpam hi nāyānti yamakiṁkarāḥ*

10. *Skanda P.V.* 3.97.164 *kanyāpustakayor dātā*; and Ib.229.23 *lekhāpayitvā satatam narmadācaritam śubham*

11. *Padma P. Uttara* 194.9 *striyaḥ śūdrādayo ye ca teṣām bodho yathā bhavet*

12. *Skanda* P.II.1.27.41-42; 41 *soṣṇīsamastakā......te bālāḥ prajāyaute*; 42 *tāmbūlam bhakṣayanto......śvaviṣṭhām bhakṣayantyete.*

S. K. LAL, Poona :

FEMALE DIVINITIES VIS-À-VIS ŚRAUTA RITES

The employment of a divinity, whether male or female, in a *Śrauta* rite is primarily intended for the smooth functioning and successful completion of the rite, so that the desired goal accrues unfailingly to the sacrificer. Gods and goddesses constitute the body of the sacrifice, not its soul. They are means, not ends.

Although male divinities hold prominent positions in the Vedic thought pattern, the place of female divinities in the *Śrauta* and *Gṛhya* rites is not insignificant[1] The aim of this paper is to scan through some of the *Śrauta* rites with a view to presenting an account of the different roles played by female divinities in the Vedic sacrifices. For this purpose, the paper has been divided under two broad headings, *viz.*

1. Female divinities and Vedic sacrifices in general : a survey,
2. Female divinities and *Śrauta* rites in particular.

I

Female Divinities and Vedic Sacrifices in general : a survey :

There are certain references in the Vedic texts which point out that female divinities are worthy of a sacrifice and that they receive a share therein. For instance, *RV* 3.54.18 says that Aditi[2] deserves a sacrifice. Agni is prayed to bring Aditi to the place of the sacrifice (*RV* 7.39.5). She is invoked in a rite for the protection of the sacrifice from disturbance.[3] *Ākuti*, intention personified, is described as the mother of the sacrifice (*TB* 2.5.3.2). I*ḍā*, personification of food and libation, is mentioned as an exponent of the sacrificial lore (*TB* 1.1.4.4). Vāgdevī has a close connection with sacrifice (*MS* 3.7.5). She is the first to have comprehended and expounded the science of sacrifice. I*ḍā*, Sarasvatī, and Bhāratī are implored for placing the sacrifice amidst the gods,[4] they themselves obtain strength from the offerings made at the sacrifices. They have been solicited for the continuation of the sacrificial activities (*VS* 20.43; *TB* 2.6.8.4). Gāyatrī, a solar divinity, is besought to protect the sacrificer from any harm that may come during the course of the sacrifice (*KS* 15.7). Agni is invoked to bring Dhiṣaṇā, goddess of intellect, to the place of the sacrifice for protection and wealth (*RV* 1.22.10). Nadī-devatās bring out Soma stalks with their delicate hands, cleanse them, pound them and offer the juice to their lord, Indra (*RV* 3.36.7). They increase Soma

(*RV* 9.9.4). In appreciation of their this good deed, lord Soma (=Soma god) offers them an honourable place to sit beside him (*RV* 9.86.21). It is also enjoined that oblations should be offered and offerings should be made to the Nadī-devatās. Particularly river-goddess Sarasvatī is earnestly urged upon to accept the sacrifice (*RV* 1.3.10, 11). In *RV* 3.4.8., she, along with other kindred rivers, is invoked to come to the sacrifice and sit on the sacrificial grass (*RV* 3.4.8; 7.2.8). Anumati, permission or favour personified, favours the sacrifice among the gods who are present at the sacrifice. She brings happiness to the sacrificer (*VS* 34.9). She acts as a mediator between the sacrificer and the gods (*AB* 7.10). The wife of the sacrificer has also some work to do in a Vedic sacrifice. When a sacrifice has been commenced, and if the wife of the sacrificer dies or disappears during the course of that sacrifice, a female divinity, namely, Śraddhā, faith personified, is the substitute for his wife. Śraddhā purifies the heart of the sacrificer. The Yajamāna forms a pair with Śraddhā, and by means of such a union, he attains *svarga* (*AB* 7.10).

Some of the female divinities are closely linked with Soma pressing and even Soma drinking. It is mentioned that Aditi takes delight in drinking Soma (*RV* 9.81.5), and so Soma juice is offered to her (*TS* 3.2.5.1). From among the different Soma-*grahas*, Aditi receives a share of Soma in the Ādityagraha (*ŚB* 4.9.2.6,7). *TS* 3.2.5.:2 says that goddess Vāk relishes the Soma drink. She is also asked to sit down beside lord Soma and enjoy Soma-drink in his company (*VS* 8.37). Iḍā, Sarasvatī, and Bhāratī, are asked to press Soma for Indra.[5] Goddess Gāyatrī is associated with the morning pressing.[6] On the celestial level, it is she who brings Soma from his heavenly abode.[7] Dhiṣaṇā prepares a drink of Soma (*RV* 4.34.1), and offers it longingly for the pleasure of the gods (*RV* 1.109.4). It is said that the grāvans (press-stones) are placed in the womb of Dhiṣaṇā; Soma is pressed there and Indra and Agni enjoy that drink (*RV* 1.109.3). Vasatīvarī water is regarded as the seven rivers, and it is supposed that the seven rivers adorn Soma in the form of vasatīvarī waters (*RV* 9.92.4). It is said that the Adābhyā cup of Soma is Vāk herself (*ŚB* 11.5.9.1-2). Goddess Vāk serves as a means for the performance of a sacrifice (*KB* 13.9; 17.7). She is the hotṛ of the sacrifice.[8] Her name itself is Hotrā.[9] Sarasvatī carries the sacrifice (*RV* 1.3.11) to the gods.

II

2. Female Divinities and Śrauta rites in particular :

Vedi :

Vedi is often compared to a woman or the womb of a woman. Iḍā has been identified with vedi (*TS* 7.4.18.2) which is said to represent the entire earth (*RV* 2.10.1). Agni sits in the lap of Iḍā, *i. e.* Vedi (*RV* I.128.1). It is said that Prajāpati was above before he created the universe. He had only two companions, namely, Vāk and words. He contemplated that by performing a sacrifice, he would become manifold. He performed a sacrifice. In that sacrifice, Vāk served as a Vedi.[10]

Dīkṣā :

Dīkṣā is the preparatory rite in a Soma sacrifice. It prepares the sacrificer to undergo the full course of a sacrifice. In the Dīkṣā rite, four oblations are offered respectively to : (1) Ākūti, (2) Medhā, (3) Dīkṣā, (4) Sarasvatī.[11] It is noteworthy that Dīkṣā itself is regarded as a female divinity. In the same ceremony, Soma is asked to initiate the sacrificer for Śraddhā (*JB* 2.65).

Agnicayana :

The piling of the fire-altar constitutes an important rite in a Soma sacrifice. The fire-altar symbolizes the great cosmic womb. Female divinities play significant roles in the Agnicayana. For instance, the Adhvaryu, after placing the fire on the āsandī, loosens the knot of the sling that holds the ukhā (fire-pan) and recites *RV* 1.24.15. In this *Rk*, Varuṇa is besought to loosen the three bonds, *i. e.* upper, lower and middle, of the sacrificer, and bestow on him the loving care of the goddess Aditi.[12] It should be noted that Aditi is closely connected with Varuṇa's *Rta* and *pāśa*. Sinīvālī, a goddess of fertility and child birth, is asked to soften the clay used for preparing the ukhā, (ukhā is a symbol of womb), and hand it over to the goddess Aditi who will receive Agni pleasantly like a mother.[13]In another place, Aditi herself is implored to fashion the ukhā with her mighty arms and skill and then bear Agni. In the rite of baking the ukhā, Aditi is invoked, along with the wives of gods, Dhiṣaṇā, Gnāḥ, and Varutri.[14] They are assigned different functions connected with the baking ceremony. When the uttaravedi has been piled up, it is supposed that it becomes very hot, and, therefore, after the recitation of the Śatarudrīya, water is sprinkled on it to lessen the heat. Agni is then invoked to descend on the altar which is regarded as the comfortable lap of the mother-goddess river.[15] The river goddessess are invoked also while laying down the bricks known as the Kumbheṣṭakās.[16] When the Chāndogyā bricks are laid down on the fifth layer of the fire altar, the goddess Rātri is addressed as the uniting metre. (*ŚB* 8.5.2.5). While the Svayaṁmātṛṇṇā bricks are being put down on the fire-altar in different quarters, the quarters are addressed to bring the favour of Sarasvatī and strengthen the speech of the sacrificer (*TS* 5.3.6.2). In the Vasordhārā rite, after the fire-altar is built up, the Adhvaryu wishes to obtain the grace of Vāk.[17] Sarasvatī and her consort Sarasvat are invoked in this rite.[18] While piling up the Prāṇabhṛt bricks, the Adhvaryu says that he takes Vāk for offering (*TS* 4.3.2.3). Carus are also offered to the four lunar divinities in the Agnicayana, when four logestakas are placed near the spine of the altar (*Kāt. ŚS* 18.106-107).

Darśapūrṇamāsa :

In the Patnīsaṁyāja rite of the Darśapūrṇamāsa, *Āś ŚS* 1.10 employs *RV* 3.4.11 where Aditi is invoked to come to the sacrifice and take her seat on the *barhis*. In the same rite, four spoonfulls of clarified butter are taken into the *juhu* and chaff of rice is added to it. The oblation of this mixture if offered to Sarasvatī (*MS* 1.4.2.3).

When the Adhvaryu takes up the two spoons, namely; *sruc* (or *juhu*) and *sruva*, he invokes goddess Sarasvatī. It may be pointed out that *juhu* is regarded as a tongue, the place of Sarasvatī (*VS* 2.20). Offerings are also made to Sinīvālī, Kuhū, and Rākā.[19]

Pravargya :

In the Pravargya rite of the Soma sacrifice, while offering two Rauhiṇa cakes, goddess Rātri is invoked to be pleased with her brightness (*VS* 3.7,21). In the same ceremony, the Adhvaryu prays to Bṛhaspati to grant him the favour of Sarasvatī (*MS* 4.9.3). The Agnihotra cow is addressed as Sarasvatī.[20] The udders of the Agnihotra cow are compared to the breasts of Sarasvatī (*RV* 10.164.49; *VS* 38.5). In the rite connected with the disposal of the Pravargya, Anumati is invoked and *AV* 7.21.2 and 34.9 are recited on the occasion.

Aśvinaśastra :

In the Prātaranuvāka of the Aśvinaśastra, Agni is prayed to bring Aditi along with the Ādityas.[21] After the conclusion of this anuvāka, the Adhvaryu offers clarified butter in the fire in the honour of Dhiṣaṇā, Agni, and the divinities of the waters.[22]

Vājapeya :

In the Vājapeya sacrifice, in a rite connected with removing the chariot from the South of the Mahāvedi to the Uttaravedi, the hymn *RV* 1.89 is recited which is an invocation to Aditi. *VS* 9.27 (=*RV* 10.141. 5.) is employed in the *vājaprasavanīya* rite of the Vājapeya sacrifice where Sarasvatī is invoked with Vāk and other gods for obtaining gifts and boons. After the rite is over, the Adhvaryu sprinkles the yajamāna on the head with remaining homa-dravya, and it is believed, this puts him under the good care of goddess Sarasvatī (*VS* 9.30).

Sautrāmaṇī :

This sacrifice consists mainly of the offering of *surā* and flesh of goat and ewe to the three major divinities, *viz.* Aśvins, Sarasvatī, and Indra. Aśvins and Sarasvatī are regarded as the physicians and Indra as the patient (*VS* 19.12). Goddess Sarasvatī, along with some other divinities, is implored to cure Indra of his sickness caused by excessive drinking of Soma (*VS* 19.80). Gāyatrī is also invoked to grant Indra power and life (*VS* 21.22). In the same sacrifice, while sitting down on the *āsandī*, the sacrificer touches the limbs of his body, recites the benedictory verses, and invokes Sarasvatī for powerful speech (*VS* 20.6). In this sacrifice, Śraddhā functions as *dīkṣā* (*ŚB* 12.8.3,4).[23] When the Yajamāna puts three sticks on the Āhavanīya fire, he says that he is performing this act having first obtained the grace of Śraddhā (*VS* 20.40).

Rājasūya :

In the Ratnīnāmahaviṁṣi rite of the Rājasūya, the king offers a pap to Aditi in the house of his chief queen, for Aditi is regarded as the wife of the gods (*ŚB* 5.3.1.4) as the queen is the wife of the king.[24] In the Prayuj rite of this sacrifice, *caru* is offered to the goddess Sarasvatī.[25] While the Adhvaryu prepares water for the *abhiṣeka* ceremony, and spreads a tiger's skin in front of the Maitrāvaruṇa's *diṣṇyās*, *VS* 10.5 is recited where Sarasvatī is invoked. *Caru* is offered to Sarasvatī in the Vaiśvadeva offerings.[26] She receives *caru* in the Sākamedha offerings also.[27] The four lunar divinities, Sinīvālī, Kuhū, Anumati and Rākā, along with Prajāpati (Kaḥ), are the deities of the Devikā oblations in the Rājasūya sacrifice (*Āś ŚS* 6.14.15). They are compared with the five directions. There the four female deities represent four regions and Prajāpati represents the one above. When the sacrificer figuratively ascends all the directions, devī Gāyatrī is invoked to protect him in the east. [8]

Aśvamedha :

TS 4.6.6.4 employs *RV* 6.75.12; 17 in the Aśvamedha when the king rides on his chariot. In these two *Rks*, Aditi is besought to grant him protection from arrows in the battle-field. Gāyatrī is also invoked in this sacrifice (*KS* 43.2; 51.1). In the same sacrifice, a black buck is offered to goddess Rātri (*VS* 24.30).

Gargatrirātra :

In this sacrifice (also known as Sahasradakṣiṇatrirātra—a sacrifice of three pressing-days in which one thousand cows are given as dakṣiṇā to the priests),[29] the Adhvaryu leads the *sāhasrī* (one thousandth) cow to the sacrificial ground and makes her smell the droṇakalaśa which is already kept in the north of the *havirdhāna* shed. He mutters in her right ear addressing her as goddess Iḍā.[30] The *sāhasrī* cow is regarded also as Vāk and the remaining 999 cows are regarded as her progeny (*ŚB* 4.5.8.3-4)[31].

There are certain female divinities who, though not directly involved in a sacrifice, are invoked, and offerings are made to them to keep them away from the sacrifice. Such divinites are inimical in nature and their presence hampers the smooth functioning of a sacrifice. They are prayed to remove any impedements or obstacles in the performance of a sacrifice. One such divinity is Nirṛti. When the Gārhapatya fire has been piled up, three bricks for Nirṛti are taken out from it and with these bricks the priest and the sacrificer proceed to the south-western quarter and lay down the bricks in a cleft or a hollow reciting *VS* 12.62-64. Between the sacrificer and the bricks, water is poured out. This rite aims at the warding off Nirṛti who is a goddess of perdition and misfortune. If a cake for offering to a divinity is burnt, it shows that that sacrifice is possessed by Nirṛti. Therefore, the offering is suspended and another cake is baked for the deity concerned (*ĀpŚS* 9.15.6-9). The presiding divinities of the

quarters are begged to release the sacrificer from the fetters of Nirṛti. The press-stones are solicited to keep Nirṛti away so that there may not be any obstacles in the sacrifice (*RV* 10.36.4). Varuṇa, the guardian of *Rta*, has been besought to keep Nirṛti away from the sacrifice (RV 1.24.9).[82] It is believed that, at the time of the recitation of the Aśvinaśastra, Nirṛti stands near the Hotṛ with her noose ready to cast on him as soon as he concludes the recitation of the Śastra. Bṛhaspati sees through her evil-design, and in order to prevent her from her evil desire, he foresees the Dvipadā verse which the Hotṛ recites in order to avert any calamity, that might befall due to Nirṛti's presence (*AB* 4.10). In the Rājasūya sacrifice, five offerings are made to Anumati, Nirṛti, and some other deities. The offering is made first to Nirṛti to placate her for removing any trouble ahead. In a Soma sacrifice, four *uparavases* (sounding holes) are dug in the cart-shed of King Soma. It is suspected that the demons have dug in the Kṛtyā-valaga (an *abhicāra*) in the world. By means of these sounding holes, the gods dig out the Kṛtyā charm, and save the world from her evil influence. This rite ensures also the smooth functioning of the sacrifice, without any evil influence of Kṛtyā.

Conclusion of the survey :

On the basis of the above brief conspectus of the *Śrauta* rituals, the parts played by the female divinities may be deduced as shown in the following table :

Female deities	*Śrauta* rituals
Aditi	Agnicayana, Darśapūrṇamāsa, Aśvina-Śastra, Vājapeya, Rājasūya, Aśvamedha.
Ākūti	Dīkṣā
Medhā	Dīkṣā
Sarasvatī (Vāgdevī)	Dīkṣa, Vedi, Agnicayana, Vasordhārā rite, Darśapūrṇamāsa, Pravargya, Vājapeya (*vājaprasavanīyakarman*), Sautrāmaṇī, Rājasūya, Gargatrirātra.
Śraddhā	Dīkṣā, Sautrāmaṇī.
Iḍā	Vedi, Gargatrirātra.
Anumati	Agnicayana, Pravargya, Rājasūya.
Sinīvālī	Agnicayana, Darśapūrṇamāsa, Rājasūya.
Dhiṣaṇā	Agnicayana, Darśapūrṇamāsa (Barhirāharaṇa), Aśvina-Śastra.
Gnāḥ	Agnicayana.
Gāyatrī	Sautrāmaṇī, Rājasūya, Aśvamedha.
Varutri	Agnicayana.

Female deities	*Śrauta* rituals
Nadī-devatās	Agnicayana.
Nirṛti	Agnicayana (Gārhapatya fire), Soma-pressing, Aśvina-Śastra, Rājasūya.
Kṛtyā	Soma sacrifice (*uparavases*).
Rātri	Agnicayana, Pravargya, Aśvamedha.
Kuhū	Agnicayana, Darśapūrṇamāsa, Rājasūya.
Rākā	Agnicayana, Darśapūrṇamāsa, Rājasūya.

Conclusion :

A cursory glance over the above survey of the female deities in Vedic sacrifices will bring out one patent point. All the female divinities mentioned above are purely Vedic in their provenance. They must have been formulated and shaped before Aryan incursions into the Saptasindhu region.[33] That is the reason that there is no trace of any visible influence of indigenous and more prominent female divinities of the Śiva-group on these Vedic female divinities. The female divinities of the Śiva-group got boost only in the post-Vedic Brahmanic, more particularly Puranic religious thoughts and practices because of an historical revival of the indigenous mother-cult which was pushed to the background momentarily by the onslaught of the domineering Vedic sacrificial cult. The Aryan-non-Aryan dichotomy has been maintained in the Vedic *Śrauta* and *Gṛhya* rites.[34]

However, the original concept of female divinities of Vedic thinkers must have received an added support from the indigenous popular mother-goddesses so as to impel the Vedic myth-makers to elevate *their* female divinities on a par with, if not more than, their male divinities[35].

NOTES

1. For the role of female divinities in the Gṛhya rites, vide S. K. Lal, "Female Divinities vis-a-vis Matrimonial Rites", *CASS Studies*, No. 5, University of Poona, 1980, 75-80.
2. For the growth, nature, and function of some of the female deities mentioned in this paper, refer to S. K. Lal, *Female Divinities*, CASS publication, University of Poona, 1980.
3. *Kauś* 46.4 ; 5 ; *AV* 6.7.1.
4. *VS* 28.18 ; 29.8 ; *TS* 5.1.11.3; *MS* 3.16.2.
5. *VS* 20.63; *MS* 3.11.3, *KS* 38.8.
6. *TS* 3.2.9.1; *ŚB* 4.1.1.8.

7. *ŚB* 3.6.2.2f ; *AB* 3.25.26.
8. *KB* 13.9; 17.7; *GB* 2.3.8; 5.4.
9. *RV* 1.120.1 ; 129.7 ; 10.64.15.
10. *MS* 1.9.1 ; *TĀ* 3.1.1.
11. *TS* 1.2.2.9 ; *VS* 4.7 ; *MS* 1.2.2; *KS* 2.2.
12. *TS* 4.2.1.3 ; 4 ; *MS* 1.2.18 ; 4.4.17 ; *A*V 7.88.3 ; *ŚB* 6.7.3.8.
13. *TS* 4.1.5.3 ; *MS* 2.7.5.
14. *TS* 4.1.6.1 ; *ŚB* 6.5.1.10 ; 11.
15. V*S* 17.6 ; *ŚB* 9.1.2.27; *TS* 4.6.1.2 : *MS* 2.10.1.
16. *TS* 5.6.1.2-4 ; *MS* 2.13.1.
17. *TS* 4.7.1.2 ; V*S* 18.2 ; *MS* 2.11.2 ; *KS* 3.10.
18. V*S* 18.20 ; *TS* 4.7.6.1.
19. *ĀpŚS* 3.9.4 ; V*arāhŚS* 1.1.4.9.
20. *VS* 38.1; *ŚB* 14.2.17,15.
21. R*V* 7.10.4; *TS* 5.1.11.2.
22. *TS* 1.3.13.1; *VS* 6.26, *ŚB* 3.9.3.14; *MS* 1.3.1.
23. There is no D*īkṣā* rite in the Sautrāma*ṇī*.
24. *MS* 4.3.8; *TS* 1.8.9.1; *ŚB* 5.3.1.4.
25. *TS* 1.8.20.1; *TB* 1.8.4.
26. *TS* 1.8.2.1; *TB* 1.6.2.3; *ŚB* 5.3.2.10.
27. *TS* 1.8.4.2; *TB* 1.6.6.7; *VS* 3.49-50; *ŚB*. 2.5.3.1.
28. *TS* 1.8.13.1; *ŚB* 5.4 1.3.
29. *TS* 7.1.5; *KātŚS* 13.4.15.
30. *TS* 7.1.6.8; *VS* 8.43; *ŚB* 4.5.8.1;
31. One may appreciate the clever imagery here. The 1000th cow is V*ā*k, goddess of speech; and the 999 cows, following her, may be understood as syllables.
32. *TS* 1.4.45.1 employes this *Rk* in the *avabhṛtha* ceremony.
33. The broad features of the Vedic sacrifice including the Soma sacrifice had already taken shape in the proto-Aryan period in the Balkh region before Indo-Aryans and Irano-Aryans separated and proceeded to two different direction, vizil, the east and the south of Balkh respectively.

    (R. N. DANDEKAR, "The Antecedents and the early Beginnings of the Vedic Period", Presidential Address, Xth Indian History Congress, p. 52. f.
34. S.K. LAL, "Female Divinities vis-a-vis Matrimonial Rites", o. c., p. 80.
35. S.K. LAL, *Female Divinties*, o. c., p. 21.

U. N. DHAL, Bhubaneswar :

A NOTE ON THE ICONOGRAPHY OF HARIHARA IN THE PURĀṆAS

An icon is a visual symbol of a concept or idea formed in the mind and is the representation of the ultimate Reality as the synthesis of what can be expressed and what cannot be. Since it is being the combination of form and no-form, it is often visually represented through multiple physical properties of the form or by expressing as an aggregate of a number of forms drawn from nature. So we find the composite character of different deities like multiple heads, hands, *etc*. Such character of a deity seeks to portray the unlimited power of the deity. The multiple aspects can very well be marked in the image of Śiva with five heads, Brahamā with three heads, Gaṇeśa with one or five elephant heads with proportionate number of heads carrying different emblems and attributes. Similarly different divinities of Hindu pantheon carry different composite characters. Over and above these one can find some images having composite forms.[1] In such images two or more deities are combined to form one. They are variously called *miśramūrti*, 'mixed form', *yugmamūrti* or *yāmalamūrti*, 'joint form' *saṁghātamūrti*, 'unified form', *kāntāsahita* or *kāntāsaṁyukta*, 'unified with the consort', and *dehārdhadhārin*, 'sharing the same body' *etc*.

Among the galaxy of composite images mention may be made of Harihara, Haribrahmā, Mārtaṇḍabhairava, Śivarāma, Ardhanārīśvara, Ardhalakṣmīhari or Vāsudevakamalā, Śaktigaṇapati *etc*. These images in a characteristic way illustrate the fusion of, or rapprochement between two, three or more rival cults. The purpose of this discussion is to highlight one of the composite images namely Harihara as it appears in the Purāṇas. The icon is differently known in different texts like Haryardhahara, Hariśaṁkara, Śivakeśava, Śaṁkaranārāyaṇa, Śivanārāyaṇa, Rudranārāyaṇa *etc*.

The Genesis of the Concept :

In some Purāṇic works Śiva is pictured as Gaurī-Śiva that is Śiva as Ardhanārīśvara, where the right portion is Śiva and the left is Pārvatī. This model of conjugal inseparability, the most important representation of the idea of the androgynous primeval being Ardhanārīśvara 'the lord who is half female and half male' has been rightly stressed at. It appears to be the result of the development of the Upaniṣadic myth of the Ātman who was as large as a man and a woman. The predilection of Indian mind for such an image depicting this divine male—female polarity seems to be

no chance occurrence. In later stage this conveys the sense of toleration of these two cults like Śiva and Śakti. Like Gaurī as the constant companion of Śiva, Viṣṇu in the form of Mohinī 'enchantress' is said to have such connection with him.

In our mythological tract the role of Viṣṇu as Mohinī appears to be very interesting. In one tradition she is pictured to have originated from Viṣṇumāyā to serve the purpose of the lord, when there was terrible battle between Viṣṇu and the two demons namely Madhu and Kaiṭabha. There she was well known as Mohinī.[2] In Dāruvana myth it is said that when Śiva entered naked into the Devadāru forest to allure the wives of the sages to spoil their (Sages') merit, Keśava accompanied him in the guise of Mohinī to attract their offspring.[3] She is also included among the twenty two incarnations of Viṣṇu,[4] who could provide the nectar to the gods by keeping the demons spellbound.

Besides these short references we come across a very popular and illuminating myth of the churning of the ocean,[5] where she plays a very important role. Even though there is divergence in the account of the legend and the number of objects churned out of the ocean, the significant role of Viṣṇu as Mohinī is equally accepted by all. After the churning of the ocean, quarrel ensued between the gods and the demons for the possession of the costly objects, above all for the enjoyment of the ambrosia. The demons being very powerful snatched away the pot of nectar from Dhanvantari to distribute it among themselves. At this critical juncture Viṣṇu assumed the most amazing form of a damsel, Mohinī, and took possession of the jar of nectar from the demons by alluring their mind and assuring them to distribute it among both the parties, but divided it among the gods only. When the nectar was wellnigh consumed Mohinī disappeared. As a result hostility outbroke between the gods and demons leading to the defeat and surrender of demons.

In the earlier version of churning of the ocean, the relation of Śiva with Mohinī is not specific, but in a later account[6] the carnal relation of Śiva with Mohinī is made clear. After the churning of the ocean when the demons were defeated Śiva wanted to behold that Mohinī, who could enchant the demons so easily. Viṣṇu in Mohinī-form appeared again. Beholding such a fair-eyed damsel Śiva was too much enamoured, ran after her abandoning Pārvatī, who stood beside him had lowered down in shame. Overpowered with love Śiva embraced Mohinī again and again by force, as a result his seed fell upon the ground but Mohinī disappeared abruptly. Thus befooled by Mohinī Śiva ultimately recovered from infatuation. Similarly another Śivaite tradition[7] states : One day Śiva beheld Mohinī, the deluding potency of Viṣṇu-Māyā and was struck by Kāma's arrows. His seed fell down. The seven sages put the seed in a pot and infused it into the daughter of Gautama through her ear. Hanuman, the monkey-god was born out of it, who rendered yeomen service to Rāma in the past.

These later accounts speak in clear terms the love of Śiva with Mohinī. In subsequent ages such tradition became deep-rooted and Mohinī is said to be united with Śiva. Moreover Pārvatī is also identified with Mohinī, a form of Viṣṇu. In the Viśvarūpa of Śiva it is said[8] that the entire world is pervaded by Rudra and Nārāyaṇa. While Viṣṇu is Prakṛti, Śiva is Puruṣa, and Viṣṇu occupied one half of Śiva. Since Viṣṇu is the active power (*śakti*) of Śiva, like Pārvatī she occupies the left half. Like Viṣṇu the left half of Rudranārāyaṇa is dark-blue having the sign of Śrīvatsa on the chest, where as the right side resembles Śiva and appears purple (*nīlalohita*) :

ātmānaṁ prakṛtiṁ viddhi māṁ viddhi puruṣaṁ Śivam |
bhavān arddhaśarīraṁ me tvahaṁ tava yathaiva ca || 23.
vāmapārśvam ahaṁ mahyaṁ śyāmaṁ śrīvatsalakṣaṇam |
tvañca vāmetaraṁ pārśvaṁ tvahaṁ vai nīlalohitaḥ || 24.
(*Vāyu Purāṇa* I.25.23-24.)

Thus it may not be difficult to hazard that like pārvatī, Mohinī in her original form (Viṣṇu) occupies the left side of Śiva, which is represented in the iconography of Harihara. Is it due to this that the right half of Ardhanārīśvara is sculptured in consonance with Harihara ?

Among the other two group of accounts synthesising Hari with Hara, one group lays emphasis on the role of Viṣṇu whereas the other group tries to assign more prominence to Śiva. One of the Viṣṇuite traditions[9] seeks to refer to it in the context of an encounter of Bāṇāsura with Kṛṣṇa. Bāṇa was a staunch devotee of Śiva. Due to Śiva's boon he was unconquerable. Once hostility broke out between Bāṇa and Kṛṣṇa to release Aniruddha, who was confined by Bāṇa. In the terrible fight Śiva alongwith his gaṇas fought on Bāṇa's behalf. Towards the later part of the battle when Bāṇa was about to be defeated, Śiva approached Govinda on Bāṇa's behalf to solicit a suspension of hostilities. Due to Śiva's supplications Govinda was pleased and dismissed his resentment against the demon and assured safety to Bāṇa as was done to him by Śiva earlier. In course of his assurance he emphasised the identification of Śiva with him and how people stupified by ignorance contemplate distinction between them. It is doubtless that this legend describes a serious struggle between the Śaivas and the Vaiṣṇavas. And the Śaivas, although attempted to make out a sort of compromise between Śiva and Kṛṣṇa are obliged to admit their having the worst of the conflict and their inability to protect their votary.

A subsequent tradition of Vaiṣṇavaite leaning puts the same concept in a different context. Here the idea appears to be more developed. When the gods failed to understand the spirit of compromise between the two sects *viz.* Viṣṇu and Śiva (one lays emphasis on *sattvaguṇa*, whereas the other on *tamaguṇa*), Hari demonstrates both the sectarian gods in his own body. One half of Hari had three eyes and the ear-rings formed of snakes as well as lotuses. With the ensigns of matted locks of Śaṁkara,

Garuḍa and Bull the breast was decorated with a necklace and snakes, the waist was covered by yellow robes and deer skin simultaneously. The hands of one side were bearing the discus and the sword, the plough and Śāraṁga bow and of the other side were equipped with Pināka, spear and Ajagava arms. It was furnished with Khaṭvāṁga, a skull bone, a bell and was resonant with the sound of a conch-shell. Thus the form of the concept appears to be clear. But the iconographic features do not appear to be specific. Because of its Viṣṇuite character Viṣṇu takes the lead in coalition.

The other tradition accepts the same, seeks to remodel it by placing Śiva at the head. Instead of Viṣṇu, Śiva plays the vital role to bring in compromise between the two warning groups thus : Once there was rivalry between the devotees of Śiva and Keśava. Rudra tried to conciliate them. He assumed the form of Harihara. In one half of his body appeared the signs of Hari and the other half Hara. The left side became Hari having the colour of the dark cloud (*meghavarṇabha*) and Vainateya stood by his side as his carrier, whereas the right side turned white like camphor (*Karpūra-gaura*) and the bull was shown as his ensign. Thus Śiva convinced the two groups about their unity in diversity.[11] When both the cults are fused, one finds no difference or rivalry between them. As a consequence whosoever adores Śiva, is deemed to have adored Viṣṇu and the vice versa. Wherever Śiva is present, Viṣṇu is there. Thus the syncretic tendency of the two cults found in the Purāṇas took its concrete shape in the works dealing with iconographical features of the image of Harihara.

Iconography of Harihara in Purāṇa literature :

Besides the traditional five characteristics, the Purāṇas contain elaborate details about *pratimālakṣaṇa*. Among them the Matsya appears to be the earliest one. According to the text[12] the instructions for the construction of Śivanārāyaṇa image is as follows : In the image of Śivanārāyaṇa the left half of the body should represent Nārāyaṇa and the right half Śiva. Both the arms of the left side should be decorated with jewels and armlets holding *Śaṁkha* 'conch' and Cakra 'quoit' and the fingers should be reddish. In place of *Cakra Gadā* can be placed in one of the hands but *Śaṁkha* should remain unaltered. The waist of this side should be draped with yellow garment studded with white gems, and the foot should be adorned with the ornaments of gems. The right side occupying the Śiva portion should be adorned with matted locks of hair with crescent moon on it. Encircled by serpents in the form of armlet the right hand should be made in *varada mudrā* " the posture of making a gift" and *triśūla* 'trident' should be placed in the other one, The right half should have a serpent as sacred thread and half of the lion should be covered with tiger skin; the foot should be adorned with jewels and serpents. Thus the image of Śiva and Nārāyaṇa blended together into one should be presented. The composite image emphasises the reconciliation between the two major cults of India. Besides this, other iconographical texts like Kāśyapaśilpam and others seek to furnish the detailed canon of the sculptural representation of the same.

Sculptural representation of Harihara :

We come across numerous images of Harihara in various temples. Though there are certain diversities in their emblems and attributes, basically they carry the same spirit of co-existence. Leaving them aside for future discussion I cite here two representative sculptures to justify their purpose. One among them is a renowned Viṣṇuite deity of South India widely known as Veṁkaṭeśa at Tirupati, Andhrapradesh. The image is described as Harihara. It is a standing image with four hands. As the right half represents Śiva, on the fore-arm is to be seen the *bhujaṁgavalaya*, 'the bangle of snake', the ornament characteristic of Śiva, and the other hand is held in *abhaya* pose. The left half is of Hari. In the two hands of the left side he carries the *Śaṁkha* and *Cakra*.[13] Thus the Viṣṇuite image stands as a symbol of cohesion probably to bring about compromise among the two warring groups of votaries of the Vaiṣṇavas and the Śaivas.

Like Veṁkaṭeśa of Viṣṇuite order, the Liṁgarāja at Bhubaneswar, Orissa, affords ample evidence to show how this Śaiva shrine was influenced by the Jagannātha-Viṣṇu cult. The influence of the Viṣṇu cult can very well be marked if one observes the various rites and ceremonies minutely. In daily worship Vaiṣṇava mantras and Śaiva mantras are invoked simultaneously. Like the Jagannātha-Viṣṇu of Puri, *Mahāprasāda* (in the form of cooked rice) is also offered to Liṁgarāja of Bhubaneswar. The festivals favourable to Viṣṇu are also observed in this temple. The leaves of *Vilva* and *Tulasī* favourites of Śiva and Viṣṇu respectively are used in daily worship. Ekāmra Purāṇa and other allied texts were composed to pioneer the cause. A natural line that exists in that *Svayambhūliṁgam* (Liṁgarāja) is pointed out by the priests as the line demar cating the Śiva and the Viṣṇu portion of the same deity, invoked as Harihara. The *Vṛṣastamba*, which now stands in fornt of the *Bhogamaṇḍapa* bears at the top not only a Bull, the mount of Śiva, but also a Garuḍa, the mount of Viṣṇu. The attributes of the crowning members of the Liṁgarāja temple can be seen from a distance and the topmost two of them, are an *āyudha i. e. Triśūla* 'trident' and a disc. One symbolises a Śiva shrine whereas the other a Vaiṣṇava one. Similarly different Vaiṣṇavaite features were also introduced to the shrine which are not found in any other Śiva shrines. The *Vṛṣastamba* and the two symbols on the top were built during the Gaṁga rule in Orissa (1110-1435 *A. D.*), and the renovations made by them ushered in a new era of conciliation or Viṣṇuisation of a Śiva temple. Thus it presents very interesting features of Harihara.

Historicity of Harihara image :

So far as the earliest iconographical representation of Harihara is concerned Śiva is depicted with mixed attributes in the gold coins of late Kushan period.[14] This device seems to show the beginning of the composite image of Harihara from those days. When Buddhism was spreading in full swing, probably the Hindu cults felt imperative to unite together to fight against Buddhism. Later on such composite form could gain

in popularity and was sculptured in different sanctums *etc*. Out of the epigraphical references, mention may be made of the copper plate Grant of Sīlahāra Chhadvaideva of the 10th century *A. D.*[15] (probably the earliest reference to such image) where Viṣṇu and Śiva are implored in the same verse. In another epigraph[16] (*A. D.* 1208) Śiva appears to be half Murāri and and half Śiva and carries the symbols of both to remove the notion of duality from the minds of the votaries. Thus the syncretisation of the two cult deities, which begins in the late Kushan period continues unabated in different sculptures and other works. Our purāṇic reference appears to be later than the Kushan period but the iconographic canon in the Purāṇa appears to be still later.

NOTES

1. For detailed treatment of such type of images, refer to D. C. BHATTACHARYA, *Iconology of Composite Images*, Delhi, 1980.
2. *Vāyu Purāṇa*, Sri Venkatesvara Press, Bombay, I.25.46.
3. *Kūrma Purāṇa* Cr. ed., Ed. A. S. GUPTA, All India Kashiraj Trust, Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi, 1971, II.37.9-21.
4. *Srīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, Gita Press, Gorakhpur, 8th edition, Samvat 2022, 1.3.17.
5. For detailed account of the myth, please refer to V. M. BEDEKAR, "The Legend of the Churning of the Ocean in the epics and the Purāṇas : A comparative study", *Purāṇa*, Vol. IX, No. 1, January (1967), pp.7-61.
6. *Srīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, VIII. 12;
   Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, Venkatesvara Press, Bombay, IV.10.
7. *Śiva Purāṇa*, Ed. Ramteja SASTRI. Pandita Pustakalaya, Kasi, Samvat 2020,III.20.
8. *Vāyu Purāṇa*, Venkatesvara Press, Bombay, I.25.
9. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, Gita Press, Gorakhpur, Samvat 2026, V.33.
10. *Vāmana Purāṇa*, Cr. edn., Ed. A. S. GUPTA, All India Kashiraj Trust, Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi, 1968, Ch. 36.29-30.
11. *Skanda Purāṇa*, 6.247.8-14 ;
    Allusion to the same story is traced in another work where Śiva tries to convince the Śivagaṇas how he exists in the form of Harihara. The iconographical features marked in the Skanda is repeated here. (*Vāmana Purāṇa* (Cr. ed) 41.28,48).
12. *Matsya Purāṇa*, Ed. J. Vidyasagara BHATTACHARYA, Calcutta, 1876, Ch. 259.216-27.
13. T.A.G. RAO, *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vol.I, Part-I, 2nd edn., Delhi 1968, pp. 270-71.
14. J. N. BANARJEE, *The Development of Hindu Iconography*, 2nd edn., Calcutta, 1956, pp. 123-ff.
15. *E. I.* Vol XXXIV. Ed. B. Ch. CHHABRA, p.81.
16. *E. I.* Vol. XX1 Ed. R. D. BANERJEE, p.8.

S. JENA, Sambalpur, (Orissa) :

A STUDY OF YAMA-YAMĪ LEGEND IN THE VEDAS AND NARASIṀHA PURĀṆA

Ṛgveda, the earliest scripture of India consists of different types of hymns *e.g.*, sacrificial hymns, appeasing hymns (*āprisūktas*), philosophical hymns, secular hymns, ākhyāna hymns and dialogue hymns (*saṁvāda sūktas*). In the dialogue hymn of Yama and Yamī given in the *Ṛgveda* X.10.1-14 both Yama and Yamī are represented as twins-brother and sister. They are said to be the first human pair born on earth. Yama is the brother and Yamī is his sister. Even though Yama happens to be the offspring of Vivasvat, and Saraṇyū (*RV*.10.14.5; 10.17.1), in this dialogue hymn of the *Ṛgveda* (X.10) they take pride in announcing their birth from the union of a Gandharva and an 'apsaras' (*RV*.10.10.4). Yamī desires to be united with Yama as his wife. Yama rejects the offer of his sister; and according to him their relation as brother and sister is the strong point against their union. But Yamī puts forth the argument that in the womb of their mother in the embryonic stage as twins, both of them have lived together. Nobody should violate the ordinance of god Tvaṣṭṛ who is responsible for putting them together in the embryo of the mother. Even then Yama does not relent, rather he warns his sister of the vigilant divinities who are ever watchful of the activities of human beings. They would never excuse this laxity in their moral conduct.

Still Yamī does not desist from her desire; she cites the parallel instance of the Heaven and the Earth when the Heaven by its waters fertilises the Earth. In refuting the argument of Yama that the divinities are ever watchful, in the heat of passion Yamī replies that she can very well deceive the Sun who is represented as the eye of the universe (*jagataḥ cakṣu RV*. X.10.9). By living as husband and wife they would create a very bad example for future generations, therefore Yama advises his sister to curb her passion and seek somebody else as her husband. Then Yamī becomes emotional referring to the brotherly love. As the sister she deserves all protection from her brother and Yama should satisfy her carnal desire. Yama turns a deaf ear to the frantic appeal of his sister. The union of a brother and a sister is most sinful. So he would never satisfy her longing. Yamī abuses him as a weakling, a heartless person. She is sorry that a strange woman would be united with him. But Yama maintains his stand to the last and concludes by saying : ' Embrace another Yamī, let another embrace you, you win his heart and he yours, from with him a happy and prosperous union".

Atharvaveda 18.1. 1-16 repeats the same myth of Yama and Yamī. Yamī passionately appeals his brother Yama to love her, but in calm, and quiet words Yama rejects her appeal pointing to the eternal laws of the gods that forbid the union of blood-relatives. Like *RV*. X.10.5, in *Atharvaveda* Yamī argues that since they have lain together once in their mother's womb, doing so a second time cannot possibly be wicked (*AV*.18-1.5). But Yama replies that brother and sister sleeping together is something at which his mind revolts (*AV*.18.I.14), so he is not prepared to be united with her; Yamī should therefore seek another man as her consort.

In *Sāmaveda* (IV.I.5.9) there is a single *mantra* which repeats the idea of *RV*.X.10.1.

The *Nirukta* (6th cent. B. C.) 11.34 in course of referring to Yamī quotes *RV*. X 10.14 and naturally there is the repetition of the old idea of Yama rejecting Yamī.

The *Bṛhaddevatā* (4th cent. B. C.) Ch.6.31.154 just refers to this legend as to how Yama rejects the offer of Yamī for sexual intercourse.

It is a matter of surprise that no Purāṇa-text has taken up this *Ṛg*vedic legend of Yama and Yamī. It may be that because of the social stigma attached to the union of brother and sister, later on very often condemned by the law-makers like Manu and Yājñavalkya, no redactor has ever thought of giving a place to this legend in the Purāṇa-texts. But the *Narasiṁha Purāna* is the unique exception where in Ch. 12 the legend has been depicted in detail.

Vivasvat, the sun-god is blessed with two children—Yama and Yamī. Yama is the brother and Yamī is his sister younger to him. In the sweet home of Vivasvat both of them grow up, play as they like and go wherever they desire. In course of time they pass their adolescence period and step into youth. Unbearable is the agony of love. Once it so happens that Yamī tormented by the pangs of love approaches Yama and requests him to take her as his wife. She argues as follows : A brother who does not want the company of his worthy sister is worthless. In absence of a spouse for the sister a brother who does not come forward to be her spouse, should be regarded as a non-entity even though he is alive. The person who refuses the passionate appeal of his sister is not a brother in the true sense of the term. There is no use if a brother accepts another girl as his spouse when in his very presence his own sister is tormented with love and passion.

Yama replies that it is something contemptible in the world. It is a sin ; the act of co-habitation with one's own sister is looked down upon as a great sin. Nobody would consciously venture to do it. No brother would ever satisfy the carnal desire of a

sister tormented by love. This practice is found with animals, but it is not so in the human world.

Yamī argues that they have already been united in the womb of their mother, and it is not sinful, so her union with Yama for the second time would never be unholy. Then in support of her point Yamī cites the example of demon Nirṛtī who daily co-habitates with his own sister (*Svasāraṁ Nirṛtī rakṣaḥ saṁgacchati ca nityaśaḥ* 12.21).

In refuting the arguments of Yamī, Yama speaks of the conduct of the eminent people of the society as the ideal. In the tradition of *Bhagavadgītā* (3.21) Yama gives a fitting reply that whatever the high personages of society demonstrate by their actions is to be followed by the common man.[1] In this context the union of a brother and a sister is something very abhorring. Therefore she would do better by choosing some other partner.

But Yamī insists and implores again and again. Yama sticks to the path of righteousness, the ideal conduct of the elite, and he never surrenders. In consequence he attains the status of divinity.

According to 1. *Abschnitt sarga-pratisarga Textgruppe* IIA.7 *Kapitel* verses 18-19 of KIRFEL's *Purāṇa pañcalakṣaṇa* Ākūti, the wife of Ruci Prajāpati gives birth to twins—Yajña and Dakṣinā and both of them are married together. In the same text verses 29-30 Hiṁsā, the wife of Adharma begets a son, Anṛta and a daughter, Nikṛti. And both Anṛta and Nikṛti intermarry with each other even though they are related as brother and sister. After their inter-marriage they have two sons, Bhaya, Naraka, and two daughters, Māyā, and Vedanā. Bhaya gets married to Māyā and Naraka gets married to Vedanā.

Thus in the Purāṇa literature though there is reference to the inter-marriage of brother and sister in the examples cited above, we notice that Yajña-Dakṣinā, Anṛta-Nikṛti, Bhaya-Māyā or Naraka-Vedanā-these are all abstract qualities. And they do not have anything to do with reality.[2]

---

1. *Yad yadācarati śreṣṭhas tat tadevetaro janaḥ |*
   Sa yat pramāṇaṁ kurute lokas tadanuvartate ||

2. Of course in Purāṇa Literature we notice a few real cases of inter-marriage of such nature occurring between brother and sister. According to verse 6 Text grouph I, 3. Kapital. 4. Abschnitt of *Kirfel's Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* p.384 Nahuṣa has six sons born from Virajā who is undoubtedly his sister (*Nahuṣasya tu dāyādāḥ ṣaḍin dropama tejasaḥ| Utpannaḥ pitṛkanyāyāṁ Virajāyāṁ mahaujasaḥ||*). Similarly according verses 11-12, B. 6. Kapital 4. Abschnitt of *Purāna Pañcalakṣana* p. 538 Taṁsu gets married to his great grand niece Ilinī, the daughter of Medhātihi and is blessed with a son called Dharmanetra. But these cases beiong to a later period since the texts form a part and parcel of Vaṁśānucarita portion, the last of the five chief characteristics of which the Purāṇas are generally constituted.

On the other hand Yama is the king ruling over the kingdom of dead. Even though the son of Saraṇyū in the Vedas (*RV*. X. 17. 1, *AV*. XVIII 1.53) in the Purāṇic age he is the son oi Saṁjñā, the daugter of Tvaṣṭṛ. In the Purāṇa-texts[3] there are different versions of the myth of Saṁjñā bearing Yama and Yamī. After giving birth to three children-Yama, Yamī and Manu, Saṁjñā, tha wife of Vivasvat intolerant of husband's brilliance leaves a substitute—Savarṇā in her place and flees to her father's abode.

Mistaking Savarṇā to be Saṁjñā, Vivasvat spends his days with Savarṇā and begets three other children on her. It is Yama who detects the step-motherly attitude of Savarṇā (from her preferential treatment of her own children-Sāvarṇi Manu, Śani and Tapatī) and in the consequence of behaving badly with her, he is cursed to lose his feet. Deeply aggrieved Yama continues to rule his subject righteously and by virtue of this righteous deed he attains the position of kingship over manes and that of the guardian of the quarters (*pitṛṇāṁ ādhipatyaṁ, Lokapālatvam*).

In the version of the story in Matsya (Ch. 11.1-39) and Padma (I. Ch. 8.35-75) through severe austerities Yama propitiates lord Śiva or Brahmā and secures these boons.

Thus in the early Purāṇic texts Yama has already been raised to the status of a divinity. In this particular story of Yama and Yamī it is no wonder that in consequence of his refusal to be united with his sister, he is elevated to this dignified position. In view of his greatness in the earlier Purāṇic texts the redactor of Narasiṁha is justified in attributing god-head to him.

Last but not the least Dyā Dviveda's *Nīti-mañjarī* (1594 A,D.) is a collection of ethical maxims illustrated as a rule by events and stories of Vedic period, In this particular text pp. 296-298 with regard to the resoluteness of god Yama in refusing love to his sister Yamī Dyā Dviveda very remarkably cites the maxim :

Saṁsāre' sthiratāṁ dṛṣṭvā nainaḥ kuryān mahānapi|
Bhaginī bhogajaṁ pāpaṁ Yamo rājāapi nākarot|| 7,138

---

3. *Vāyu* (II.22 32-86), Brahmāṇḍa (II. 59. 33-86), *Harivaṁśa* (8. 1-40), *Brahma* (6. 1-54), Bhaviṣya (I. 79. 176-83. Śiva Purāṇa 5. *Umā saṁhitā* (35. 1-42), *Mārkaṇḍeya* (chs. 106-108).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ṛgveda Saṃhitā with the commentary of Sāyaṇācārya Vol. V. Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, Poona, 1951 Der Rigveda by Karl Friedrich Goldner, Vol. III, Harvard Oriental Series 35, Camb-Mass, 1951. The Hymns of the Ṛgveda trans. with a popular commentary, Ralph T. H. Griffith, Motilal Banarsidass, Reprint, Delhi 1976.

Atharvaveda Saṁhitā (Text)—Ajmer, Vikrama Saṁvat 2001.

Atharvaveda Saṁhitā Translated by W. D. Whitney, Harvard University, 1905.

Sāmaveāa Saṁhitā Ed. by Sripada Damodara Satavalekar, Svādhyāya Maṇḍāla, Paradi, undated.

The Sāmaveda Saṁhitā (English Trans.) by Rev. J. Stevenson, Varanasi, 1961.

The Nighantu and Nirukta—L. Sarup (Text & Trans.) Motilal Banarsidass, 1967.

Bṛhaddevatā attributed to Śaunaka—Part I (Introduction & Text); Part II (Trans. & Notes) A. A. Macdonell, Motilal Banarsidass, 1965.

The Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa—W. Kirfel edited by Suryakanta Sastri, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series office, Varanasi, 1979.

Vāyu Purāṇa—Venkatesvara Press, Saṃvat 1990.

Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa—Venkatesvara Press, Saṃvat 1992.

Harivaṁśa—Cr. Edn., BORI, Poona,1976.

Brahma Purāṇa—Text with Hindi Trans. ed. by Târiṇīsa Jha, Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Prayaga, 1st Edn. 2976.

Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa—Jivananda Vidyasagar Bhattācārya, Calcutta 1879.

Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa—Translated by F. E. Pargiter, Indological Book House, Varanasi, 1969.

Śiva Purāṇa—Ed. by Ramateja Sastri, Pandita Pustakālaya. Kasi, Samvat 2020.

Bhaviṣya Purāṇa—Venkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay, 1959.

Matsya Purāṇa—Nandlal Mor, Calcutta, 1954.

Matsya Purāṇa—(Eng. Trans.) Ed. by Jamna Das Akhtar, Oriental Publishers, Delhi-6.

Padma Purāṇa Part I—Mansukharay Mor, Calcutta, 1957.

Narasiṁha Purāṇa—Gopal Narayan & Co., Bombay, 1911.

Nīti-Mañjari of Dyâ Dviveda edited by Sitaram Jayaram Joshi, Banaras, 1933.

Smt. Bidyut Lata *RAY*, Nayagarh, (Orissa) :

THE ELEMENTS OF JAGANNĀTHA-CULT AS DEPICTED IN THE SIDDHĀNTA-DARPAṆA

1. Introduction :

Orissa for ages has remained the holy land where the *Puruṣottama-Kṣetra*, being hallowed from time immemorial, is held in high esteem as one of Pan-Indian Hindu religious centres. Its impact on the psyche of the Hindus and on their corporate as well as personal religious life is conspicuous. The worship of Jagannātha-Triad at Puri is firmly embedded in rich antiquity and tradition. Its mysterious origin puzzles many scholars from time to time. Consequently they differ with each other in trying to give a new dimension in their own way to the same Cult, and as such the Cult of Jagannātha embraces Viṣṇuism, Buddhism, Jainism. Śāktism, Śaivism and Nāthism etc. The *Sauras* and *Gāṇapatyas* are also inclined to adhere to it as their own Cult. Thus, Jagannātha *Dharma* is the *Gaṇa Dharma* (religion of the masses) of Orissa and embodies within itself the principles of secularism, religious tolerance, coexistence, equality of castes and creeds of socialism. The religious culture of Orissa is the culture of Lord Jagannātha. He is the Supreme Deity and the remote cultural tradition of Orissa, He is regarded as the state deity as well as the real authority of the state. He is the great institution around which the religious culture of Orissan people is kept revolving.

The antiquity of Jagannātha even goes back to the time of the *Vedas*. In the *Ṛgveda* we find a reference to *Dāru* in the *Sūkta* which runs thus "*ado Yaddāru plavate Sindhoḥ Pāre apuruṣam|tadā rabhasva durhaṇo tena gaccha parastaram*."||[1] Besides the *Vedas*, we find references about *Puruṣottama-Kṣetra* and Jagannātha in the *purāṇaṣ*. The *Matsya-Purāna*,[2] which is considered as one of the oldest of the *purāṇas* mentions *Puruṣottama-Kṣetra* in two places, Among the later *purāṇas* namely *Viṣṇu*, *Agni*, *Padma*, *Nārada*, *Brahma* and *Skanda*, we get more references to Jagannātha, the deity and the place of his installation.[3] Some scholars have also identified the *Vedī* of the *Mahābhārata* with the Antarvedī of *Skanda-Purāṇa*. There is another reference to *Vedī* in the *Taittirīya-Saṁhitā*[4] Scholars are very much tempted to identify this *Vedī* with the Ratnavedī of Jagannātha to establish the antiquity of the temple and the place.

There is also evidence of *Dāru* worship in the *Bhagavadgīta*.[5] The *Dāru-Upāsanā* was gradually converted into the image or *Puruṣa-Upāsanā* by the time of the *Upaniṣads* which mention *Puruṣa* as the creator of the universe: The *Śvetāśvetara*

Upaniṣad[6] and the *Kaivalya Upaniṣad*[7] describe *Puruṣa* as one who possesses neither hands nor legs, who has no eyes but sees everything, no ears but hears all and who though unknowable knows everything. This description of *Puruṣa* serves as the basis of the peculiar form *Puruṣottama* and His associates. By the influence of *Sāṁkhya* philosophy, the term *Puruṣa* in its sense stands for 'the highest divine principle,' both personal and impersonal[8] for which it now rather uses the term *Puruṣottama*. *Bhagavadgītā*[9] says that there are two types of *Puruṣa* : the perishable one (*i.e.*, body) and the imperishable one (*i. e.*, individual soul). But, since Bhagavat. the Lord, is beyond both these categories of *Puruṣa*, he is known as *Puruṣottama*—the highest *Puruṣa* or *Paramātman*—the highest *Ātman*. An absolute identity between the individual *Puruṣa* and the highest *Puruṣa* is advocated in *Bhagavadgītā*. The *Puruṣa-Sūkta* of *Ṛgveda*[10] also speaks of the two forms of *Puruṣa*, one higher and the other lower.

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[11] identifies the God Viṣṇu by associating Him with the *Vedas* and the sacrifices. Hence, it was but natural to identify the *Puruṣa* of the *Ṛgveda* with the *Yajñapuruṣa* Viṣṇu. All the later Viṣṇuite and the *Pāñcarātra* literature interpret *Puruṣa-Sūkta* as an eulogy of Viṣṇu Himself.

The *Puruṣottama-Māhātmyam* of the *Skanda-Purāṇa* presents *Puruṣottama* as the '*Śabara Devatā*' or the deity devoutly worshipped by the Śabaras under the leadership of Viśvāvasu. It introduces the term *Mahāvedī-Antarvedī* in the place of '*Vedī*' of the *Mahābhārata*. It also introduces the conception of '*Caturdhā Mūrti*' (four images)—Jagannātha, Balabhadra, Subhadrā and Sudarśana. A separate *mantra* or hymn for worshipping each deity occurs for the first time in the *Skanda-Purāṇa*.

The *Nīlādri-Mahodayam*,[12] a later work composed after the model of the *Puruṣottama-Māhātmyam* of *Skanda-Purāṇa* gives a detailed account of rituals and festivals associated with the worship of *Puruṣottama*-Jagannātha. This *Sthala-Purāṇa* mentions '*Saptadhā Mūrti*' or the seven images, *viz.*, Jagannātha, Balabhadra, Subhadrā, Sudarśana, Mādhava, Śrīdevī and Bhūdevī.

Besides the above references, we also find traces of *Puruṣottama Dhāma* and the deities *Puruṣottama*, Subhadrā and Balabhadra in many other Sanskrit texts like *Bārhaspatyasūtram*, *Kapilasaṁhitā*, *Tīrthacintāmaṇi*, *Kṣetramāhātmyam*, *Puruṣottama Candrikā*, *Rudrayāmala*, *Tantrayāmala*, *Puruṣottama Tattva*, *Saubhāgya Mañjuṣā etc.*. But the mode of worship of Jagannātha triad is fully described in the texts like *Nīlādri-Mahodayam*, *Gopālārcana Vidhi*, *Nīlādrinātha Pūjāvidhi* and *Durgotsava Candrikā etc.* It is a remarkable fact that the numerous Sanskrit texts composed in Orissa from time to time extol more or less the sanctity of *Puruṣottama-Kṣetra* and its deities. Many of such texts are still under veil and some are yet to be discovered. In this context, it is noteworthy to mention that no attempt has so far been made to critically analyse the Cult of Jagannātha as viewed by Mahāmahopādhyāya Sāmanta Candraśekhara in his master-piece 'The *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa*,' a treatise on Astronomy.

2. Life of the Author and the date of Siddhānta-Darpaṇa :

The author of *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* hails from a royal family of Khaṇḍapaḍā Gaḍa of Puri disrict. The name of Bairāgī Siṁha Sāmanta, the fifth ruler of the royal family of Khaṇḍapaḍā Gaḍa, is found mentioned in the twenty-fourth chapter (*Prakāśa*) of *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa.*[13] Bairāgī Siṁha Sāmanta ruled from 1734 to 1770 *A.D.* in the-Khaṇḍapaḍā State (now situated in Nayagarh Sub-division of Puri district of Orissa).

Candraśekhara was born on the eighth day of the dark fortnight of the month of *Pausa* in the year 1835 *A.D.*, and died on the 12th day of the dark fortnight of the month of *Jyeṣṭha* in the year 1904 *A. D.* His father's name was Śyāmabandhu and mother's name was Viṣṇumāli. Śyāmabandhu was a staunch devotee of Lord Jagannātha and hence named his sons as Pitavāsa, Vāsudeva, Yadunātha Gadādhara and Cakradhara. The nick-name of Candraśekhara was Paṭhāṇi. So he was popularly known as Paṭhāṇi Sāmanta, though his real name was Sāmanta Śrī Candraśekhara Siṁha. He started his research on Astronomy in the year 1849 *A.D.*, and completed it in the year 1869 *A.D. i.e.*, at the age of thirty-four, he gave final touch to '*Siddhānta-Darpaṇa*'. As mentioned in the text of the work, it was completed in 1814 Śakābda or in the 14th Aṁka of Mukundadeva.[14] Thirty years after its completion *i.e.*, in the year 1899, the text of *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* was printed. Due to this original research on Astronomy, Candraśekhara was awarded the title 'Sāmanta' on September 28th of the year 1893 and was presented with a medal. The king of Puri added the title 'Haricandana Mahāpātra' to the name of Candraśekhara, and the author of *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* came to be known as Sāmanta Śrī Candraśekhara Siṁha Haricandana Mahāpātra. Finally, he achieved the title 'Mahāmahopādhyāya' for this benevolent work. In the present discussion, we are interested to analyse the Jagannātha Cult section of the work of Candraśekhara.

3. The concept of Saptadhā Mūrtti :

Though this extensive text is a store-house of scientific knowledge, still it has some special features on the Cult of Jagannātha. Out of the twenty-four chapters (*Prakāśa*) of the text, one chapter (*Prakāśa* 23) is completely devoted to the description of *Puruṣottama Stavas* and thereby deals with the *Māhātmyas* and the *Tattvas* of the deity *Puruṣottama* and its *Kṣetra*. *Like Nilādri-Mahodayam*[15] of 14th Century, the text of *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* also mentions *Saptadhā Mūrtti* of *Puruṣottama-Kṣetra*. They are Sri, Bhu, Mādhava, Cakrī, Avanibhṛt and Bhadrā.[16] At the out-set of the text of *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa*, the author prays for the blessings of these deities and thus proves himself as a staunch follower of Jagannāthism.

4. Location of Puruṣottama-Kṣetra :

The author hints on the purāṇic cosmography and mentions *Jambudvīpa*[16A] where the sacred *Puruṣottama-Kṣetra* exists. His *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* eulogizes to sanctity of Utkala and takes Utkala and Kaliṅga as one and the same country.[17] It mentions

that the country is unique in the world due to its deities.[18] Everyday a number of *Devas* and *Devīs* are being worshipped here. The text describes *Puruṣottama-Kṣetra* as *Śaṁkhākāra* and locates the temple of Lord Jagannātha at the central part (*Nābhisthala*) of this *Śaṁkha-Kṣetra.*[19] It refers to *Antarvedī* and depicts the *Mahimā* of *Trivedī* of *Śrī-Kṣetra*[20], and highlights its sacredness. One, who touches the temple of Lord Jagannātha and visits the deities, Jagannātha, Balabhadra and Subhadrā gets free from all types of sins and attains salvation.[21]

5. Kṛṣṇa-Component of Jagannātha Cult :

Siddhānta-Darpaṇa accepts Lord Jagannātha as Kṛṣṇa[22], and includes *Daśāvatāra Stuti* in its 23rd *Prakāśa*. Consequently it is evident that the author was a *Parama Vaiṣṇava*. He describes Kṛṣṇa as the most handsome one who bears *Śaṁkha, Cakra, Gadā* and *Padma*, who has also *Veṇu* in his hands[23]. Candraśekhara gives a philosophical thought to the Kṛṣṇa component of Jagannātha-Cult by depicting that Kṛṣṇa is *Parātmā*[24] himself who creates the universe and rules over it. He is the omnipresent.[25] Being the almighty, he is cruel like *Kālāgni* and furious like *Rudra*. At the same time he is *Maṁgalamaya* who wipes out sorrows and sufferings of the world. He who gives *Mukti* to his devotees, is the *Ghanānandamūrtti*[26] (Joyful image). He is *Saccidānanda* who belongs to *Prema* and *Bhakti*.[27] He spreads love and devotion in this world. In this Kṛṣṇa-typology, the author refers to Rādhā as the consort of Kṛṣṇa.[28] On the other hand, mention is made to Lakṣmī in the context of Lord Jagannātha who is Śrīmad-govinda[29] and Kṛṣṇa as well. Candraśekhara observes that the body of Lord Govinda is extremely beautiful like blue-lotus.[30] The Lord himself is also worshipped in the form of his ten incarnations. These incarnations as described in the *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* are *Mīna,*[31] *Kūrma,*[32] *Varāha,*[33] *Nṛsiṁha,*[34] *Vāmana,*[35] *Parśurāma,*[36] *Rāma,*[37] *Balarāma,*[38] *Buddha*[39] and *Kalki*.[40] Besides, the text also speaks of twenty-four and thirty-two *Avatāras* of the Lord and notes that He (Lord Jagannātha or Kṛṣṇa) takes also other innumerable shapes whenever required for the benefit of the world.[41]

Another important aspect of *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* is that it describes Lord Jagannātha as *Samudra,*[42] *Brahmāṇḍa,*[43] *Śiva,*[44] *Gaurī,*[45] *Vāgdevī,*[46] *Gaṇeśa,*[47] *Sūrya*[48], and above all conceives the idea of *Navagrahas*[49] in respect of the Lord. Candraśekhara argues philosophically that the various aspects of Lord Jagannātha resemble out and out with those of the above deities.

6. Samudra Aspect :

Samudra is the father of Lakṣmī. It is the domicile of *Jalahastīs* (elephants living in water), *Nāgas*, *etc*. It is the store-house of *Amṛta* (*Sudhā*) and various *Ratnas* (precious jems). It is the place of shelter of the hard and furious *Maināka* Mountain. According to Candraśekhara, the sea is the husband of the river Ganges. It carries a lot of living beings inside itself. These aquatic animals are fish, conch,

tortoise *etc*. Again the sea is the king of all the *Tīrthas*. The most fearful and vigorous aspect of the sea is that it encroaches the fourteen worlds by its water at the time of the great deluge.[50] In respect of Lord Jagannātha, the author mentions that the nose, the hands, the belly and the feet of the deity resemble the different shapes of islands of the sea. The blue-colour of Jagannātha (Kṛṣṇa) stands for the blue-water of the sea. The gems and the pearls of His *Mukuṭa* glitter like the fire created in the sea. His lips look like the boats floating in the sea. Ostensively, the Lord has close simili with the sea.[51]

7. Brahmā*ṇḍ*a Aspect :

Candraśekhara observes that Lord Jagannātha is the *Brahmāṇḍa* himself. Here, the term *Brahmāṇḍa* is used in the sense of the Universe. The Universe includes the Sun and the Moon, and so also Lord Jagannātha has two round-eyes like the Sun and the Moon. There are clouds in the sky and similarly the colour of the deity looks like the clouds. The colour of the lips of the deity has exact simili with the evening of the Universe. Lord Jagannātha has two circular and straight hands which look very much beautiful like the horizon of the Universe. There is Mount-*Meru* in the middle of *Brahmāṇḍa*. On the other hand the Lord wears golden ornaments round his waist and which stands at the middle of his body like the Mount-*Meru* of the Universe. As the image of Lord Jagannātha resembles exactly to the Universe and He himself is the ruler of the Universe, the author prays for the good-will of the deity.[52]

8. *Ś*iva Aspect :

Śiva is the Lord of the spirits and ghosts. He is the embodiment of wealth and property. His body is covered with the great snakes. He bears the river Gaṁgā on his head and this seems like the Ganges flowing from the top of the *Kailāsa*-Mountain. He is an efficient rider of *Vṛṣabha*. He had deep love and compassion towards the daughter of the King Dakṣa. He helps the people in their expedition and gives courage on the way. He is efficient in destroying unhappiness from the family life as well as from the world at large.

Similarly Lord Jagannātha is the Lord of the living beings. He is the source of worldly pleasures and is the protector of the world. He lives at the Mount-Nīlācala and holds Kamalā in his lap. He has an extended forehead like Khaṇḍa-Chandra (a part of the moon). He is the protector of Dharma and is the killer of Vṛṣāsura. He is always present in the hearts of the devotees and the pious people. Thus the author of the *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* observes a close identity with Śiva and Lord Jagannātha.[53]

9. Gaur*ī* Aspect :

The Goddess Gaurī is worshipped by all. She is the cause of the glory and the wealth of Kailāsa-Mountain. She is the Mother of the world. She killed the demons

like Caṇḍa with her penetrating rays. She loved Śiva and finally united with him. She is also known as Umā. She succeeded in killing the wicked 'Madhu-Daitya', and hence the Gods of heaven highly appreciated her deeds and enchanted the *Stuti*s in her honour. In the similar manner, Lord Jagannātha is worshipped by the deities like Lakṣmī, Śiva and Sūrya *etc*. All the deities mingle with the body of Lord Jagannātha. The goddess Sarasvatī bows her head before the feet of the Lord. He is known as *Brahmānanda*. He bears the whole world within himself. He wipes out the ignorance of his devotees. For the benefit of the people, he kills the wicked ones, and protects the world.[54]

10. Vāgdevī Aspect :

Candraśekhara mentions *Stutis* of Sarasvatī while praying for the bliss of Lord Jagannātha. He describes that the goddess Sarasvatī wears white clothes and her body is cleanly white like milk. She is praised by Viṣṇu himself, and she is always decorated with beautiful flowers. She wears those flowers appreciated by Viṣṇu. She herself represents *Brahmānanda* or Viṣṇu. She is the goddess of wisdom and spreads knowledge among the devotees. The author of *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* prays for the goddess to demolish *Māyā* from us.[55]

11. Gaṇeśa Aspect

As depicted in *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa*, Lord Jagannātha is the first worshippable deity by the gods of heaven. His glory is extolled by Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī and Brahmā *etc*. *Paraśudhārī* Śiva worships him. He is the almighty, and he is very much powerful. During the time of *Harihara*-Union, Lord Jagannātha takes the right-side of Śiva. He has lotus in his hand, and he looks beautiful by that. Likewise, Gaṇeśa always takes the right side of Śiva. Among all the gods of heaven Gaṇeśa is worshipped first. Lakṣmī, Pārvatī, Sarasvatī and Brahmā have preached his glory. He also wears lotus-flower in his hand and looks beautiful. Candraśekhara prays for Lord Jagannātha to wipe out ignorance from us and prays for Gaṇeśa to save us from the dark of *Avidyā*.[56]

12. Sūrya Aspect :

The author of *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* argues that Lord Jagannātha is Kṛṣṇa who is the source of joys of the river Yamunā. He prays the Lord to save us from the sins. According to Candraśekhara, Jagannātha gives happiness to Hari and Lakṣmī, and spreads knowledge among us. He sleeps and plays in the lap of *Ananta*-*Śeṣa*. And Garuḍa always sits in his front. He kills the demons and Yama himself serves his (Jagannātha's) feet. He holds Padma (Lotus) in his hand. He is very much calm like shadow and looks black.

In respect of the Sun, the author of the present text speaks that Sūrya is the husband of Chāyādevī. Yama serves his feet. He has lotus in his hand. Aruṇa is always present in his front. Both Garuḍa and Aruṇa are the off-spring of Vinatā, and hence they are Vainateya. The Sun is efficient in demolishing the happiness of the spirits who play their role in the night. He always exhibits his deeds in the *Ananta-Mahākāśa*. He destroys darkness by his bright beams. He is the source of gay and happiness of his daughter Kālindī as well as makes Padma joyful at his arrival. Practically, lotus blooms at the Sun-rise. Thus Candraśekhara notes a beautiful and an exact simili between the Sun and Lord Jagannātha.[57]

13. Navagraha Aspect :

Candraśekhara compares Lord Jagannātha with the *Navagrahas* and argues that he is the embodiment of all the *Grahas*. The actions of Lord Jagannātha are fully analogus to those of the *Grahas*. He accepts Lord Jagannātha as the one from Yādava-family. He (Jagannātha) is the store of *Amṛta*. He is unseen, and he is Ananta. All the Characteristics of the deity are observed in the aspects of various *Grahas*. such as, Ravi is the cause of happiness to Padma, Candra is the store-house of *Amṛta* (*Sudhā*), Vṛhaspati is worshipped by the gods like Indra *etc.*, Śukra symbolises wisdom and Rāhu is not seen by us and so on. Finally, Candraśekhara points out that Jagannātha is *Jyotirmaya*, *Acyuta* and the *Ātmā* himself. Like the *Grahas*, the Lord is sometimes furious and sometimes calm and stern (*Sthāṇu*). He is always merciful to the world for the benefit of the living-beings.[58]

Thus *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* presents the numerous aspects of Lord Jagannātha and the cult in a very analytical manner. The author of the text accepts the *Kṛṣṇa*-Version of the deity and notes the tit-bits of the actions. He accepts Jagannātha as the Kalki-*Avatāra*. Though Jagannātha is the synthesis of '*Satva, Rajaḥ* and *Tamaḥ*'; '*Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*'; '*Prema or Bhakti*'; '*Karma or Action*'; He is the Supreme *Kāla*. He is the *Puruṣa* of *Bhagavadgītā*, He is the *Puruṣottama*, the Supreme one. He symbolises Time and Change. He is eternal and infinite. He is mysterious and undestructible. He is the Lord who is the inexplicable, the unspeakable, the unthinkable the untouchable, and He who is the Absolute. He is the Upaniṣadic *Praṇava* in which the philosophy of *Brahman* and *Ātman* culminates. He is not only the Universal deity worshipped by all the castes of the Hindus but he embraces the devotees of different religions to his lap. He is the most ancient divinity, the one and the only Lord worshippable, the one and only end attainable. His total aspect is revealed from the various forms given in *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* and also from the different deities mentioned there. If we mean the comprehensive view of reality is the philosophy, then Lord Jagannātha is the philosophy himself and not a type of philosophical doctrine.

REFERENCES

1. *Ṛgveda*, X, 155, 3.
2. *Matsya Purāṇa*, Ch. XIII, Śloka 35; Ch. XIII, Śloka 38.
3. *Viṣṇu*, I, XV, 52; *Agni*, Ch. 63; *Padm*, Ch. 158, Ślokas 1-5, Ch. 18. *Nārada*, Ch. 52, Ślokas 41-93; *Brahma*, Ch. 48; *Skanda*, Ch. XX, Ślokas 35-36.
4. *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, II, 6, 4, 3 :
   "iyaṁ vediḥ paro antaḥ pṛthivyā ayam yājño bhuvansya nābhiḥ|
   pṛthivyāḥ pradhānabatyāḥ bhūmyāḥ paroāntaḥ paramanta |
   parjyavasam iyaṁ vedhiḥ nahi vedyātīrikta bhūmirasti ||"
5. *Bhagavadgītā*, Ch. XV, Śloka 1 :
   "ūrddhvamūlamadhaḥśākhamaśvatthaṁ prāhuravyayam |
   chandāṁsi yasya parṇāni yastaṁ veda sa vedavit ||"
6. *Śvetāśvetara Upaniṣad*, III, 19 :
   "apāṇipādo yavano grahītā |
   pas'yatyacakṣuḥ sa sṛṇotyakarṇaḥ ||
   sa vetti vedyaṁ na ca tasyāsti vettā |
   tamāhurārādhyaṁ puruṣaṁ mahāntam ||"
7. *Kaivalya Upaniṣad*, Mantra 21 :
   "apāṇipādo' ham acintyāsaktiḥ paśyāmya cakṣuḥ śṛṇomyakarṇa |
   ahaṁ vijānāmi viviktarūpo na cāsti vettā mama citsadaham ||"
8. *Bhagavadgītā*, 8.22a :
   "puruṣaḥ sa paraḥ pārtha bhaktyā labhyas tvananyayā |"
   Bhagavadgītā, 11.38a :
   "tvamādidevaḥ puruṣaḥ purāṇa... ... ...| "
   Bhagavadgītā, 15.4b :
   "tameva cādyaṁ puruṣaṁ prapadye yataḥ pravṛttiḥ prasṛtā purāṇī |"
9. *Bhagavadgītā*, 15.16-18 :
   "dvāvimau puruṣau loke kṣaraścākṣara eva ca |
   kṣaraḥ sarvāṇi bhūtāni kūṭastho'kṣara ucyate ||
   uttamaḥ puruṣastvanyaḥ paramātmetyudāhṛtaḥ |
   yo lokatrayamāviśya vibharttyavyaya īśvaraḥ ||
   yasmāt kṣaramatīto'ham akṣarādapi cottamaḥ |
   ato'smi loke vede ca prathitaḥ puruṣottamaḥ ||"
10. *Ṛgveda*, X.90.2 :
    "uta amṛtatvasya īśāno yad annenā dhirohati |"
    Ṛgveda, X.90.4 :
    tripād ūrdhvam udait puruṣaḥ pādo'syehābhavat punaḥ |"
11. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, V.2.3.6; V.4.5.1; XII.4.1.5 *etc.*

12. *Nīlādri Mahodayam*, Ch.VIII, XV and XXXIV.

13. *Siddhānta-Darpaṇa* (*S. D.*), 24.145 :

"asitpāśīndrakāśīśvaramihiratanūjanmarājādhirājasvārāt |
pratyarthipṛthvīdhavadahanapṛṣatpatramātrotthagātraḥ ||
prāptaśrīmarharājabhramaravarapadaḥ sattamātsārva bhaumā-|
śrīmān vairāgināmā sphuṭatamamahımā khaṇḍalaḥ khaṇḍapuryyāḥ ||

14. *S. D.* 24.160 :

"mukundadevasya caturddaśāṁke kāle vṛṣaṣṭendu 1814 *same ca śāke |*
vāre śanermārgapuronavasyāmidaṁ mayā pustakamāśta pūrṇam ||"

15. *Nīlādri Mahodayam*, 4.8a :

"saptadhāvirbhavo devaḥ svayaṁ tatra janārddanaḥ |"
Nīlādri Mahodayam, 4.7 :
"Baḷena bhadrayā yuktaḥ so'yaṁ saha sudarśanaḥ |
Viśvadhātryā ca lakṣmyā ca mādhavena samaṁ tadā ||"

16. *S. D.*, 1. 1 :

"Śrī bhū mādhava cakra cakrayavanibhṛdbhadrābhirabhyujjvalam |
Śrīkaṇṭha pramukhākhilāmara Śikhā juṣṭāṁghri pīṭhopalam ||
Śrī nīlācalamaulimaṇḍana mahānīlāyamānaṁ mahaḥ |
Śrībhūmādharitasmāraṁ bhavatu naḥ pratyuhahatyudyatam ||"

16 A. *S. D.*, 23. 13a :

"jambūdvīpākhyabhūpālikula bhuvana... ... ... |"

17. *S. D.*, 23.2 :

"Yatra kṣetraṁ pavitraṁ vilasati sitaruṁmitranetrasya gātram |
gotrā yatrāti mātrāstadavaya vasṛtā dıpavatyo vicitrāḥ ||
sva sthānasthāḥ padasthāpitanijajanatā devatāḥ santi nityā |
marttyāḥ smārttāḥ smarārttā havicaraṇaratā ścotkalaḥ stātkaliṁgaḥ ||"

18. *Ibid.*

19. *S. D.*, 23.16 :

"Premkan śaṁkhasya nābhau satatagativaśādvāhu daṇḍaiḥ pracaṇḍaiḥ |
śākhābhiścaṇḍarocıstanuja nija janān vārayan kiṁ vidurāt ||
Kalpānte' pyantahīnaḥ *sakala kaluṣahṛt sindhurājo' dhirodho |*
nyagrodhaḥ krodhakāmādyariparibhavakṛdbhūt vargasya bhūyāt ||"

20. *S. D.*, 23.6a :

"antarvedī trivedīnigaditamahimādhityakā... ... ... |"

21. *S.D.*, 23.17 :

"bhadrābhūmādhava śrīmuṣalabhṛdribhiḥ śobhitaḥ śrīvapuṣpā
nsmānuṣṇāṁsujoṣmāgamaśamanaḥ pātu devādhidevaḥ |
Janturmantunnihantuṁ prabhavati... ... ... ||"

22. *S. D.*, 23.46d :
"kṛṣṇaḥ kalyāṇakārī bhavatu... ... ... ||"
S. D., 23.50d :
"śrīkṛṣṇaḥ premabhaktiṁ vitaratu... ... ... ||"
23. *S. D.*, 23.44ab :
"mādhuryyairsvaryyapūrṇa śitidharaparamagolokanāthaḥ |
śrībhūlīlādisevyodora kamala gadā cakrabhṛd veṇupāṇiḥ ||"
24. *S. D.*, 23.44d :
"sarvavyāpi parātmā sa bhavatu bhagavān brahmabhūtirgatirnaḥ ||"
25. *Ibid.*
26. *S. D.*, 23.44c :
"bhuktermukteśca bhaktervitaraṇa nipuṇaścid ghanānandamūrtti |"
27. *S. D.*, 23.50d :
"śrīkṛṣṇaḥ premabhaktiṁ vitaratu hṛdi naḥ saccidānandarūpaḥ |
28. *S. D.* 23.51a :
"Rādhāsādhāraṇa śrīkamana sumanasaṁ... ... ... |"
29. *S. D.*, 23.30d :
"śrīmadgovindam indivararuciratamum indirānandakandam |"
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Mīnāvatāra* (*S. D.*, 23.31)
32. *Kūrmāvatāra* (*S. D.*, 23.32)
33. *Varāhāvatāra* (*S. D.*, 23.33)
34. *Nṛsiṁhāvatāra* (*S. D.*, 23.34)
35. *Vāmanāvatāra* (*S. D.*, 23.35)
36. *Parśurāmāvatāra* (*S. D.* 23.36)
37. *Rāmāvatāra* (*S. D.*, 23.37)
38. *Balarāmāvatārā* (*S. D.*, 23.38)
39. *Buddhāvatāra* (*S. D.*, 23.39)
40. *Kalki avatāra* (*S. D.*, 23.40)
41. *S. D.*, 23.41ab :
"matsyādi kalkirūpaṁ daśavidhatanu bhāksidhdhi 24 saṁkhyātmamūrtti |
dvātriṁśadgātradharttā jagadupakṛtaye klṛptanānāvatāraḥ ||"
42. Samudra (*S. D.*, 23.21-22.)

43. Brahmāṇḍa (*S. D.*, 23.23)
44. Śiva (*S. D.*, 23.24)
45. Gaurī (*S. D.*, 23.25)
46. Vāgdevī (*S. D.*, 23.26)
47. Gaṇeśa (*S. D.*, 23.27)
48. Sūrya (*S. D.*, 23.28)
49. Navagrahas (*S. D.*, 23.29-30)
50. *S. D.*, 23.21 :

"lakṣmībhṛnnāgasaṁgyāmṛta khaniraśaṁtrāsitakṣmābhṛdīśa- |
sthānaṁ svargīpagāyāḥ prabhurakhilanṛṇāṁ pāpasantāpahantā ||
śyāmaśrīrmonakūrmādyāmita tanudharaḥ śaṁkha cakrābjavāḥ |
kalpāntagra stalokaḥ kalayatu kamalaṁ tīrthārāṭ klāntiśāntyai ||"

51. *S. D.*, 23.22 :

"yatrāste sānuvimboditasitakiraṇaprojjvalaṁ netrayugmam |
nāsāvāhūdaraṁgnī sphurati ca vividhadvīpaśobhānukārī ||
vārīva śyāmalaśrīrmakarasurucire kuṇḍale vāḍavāgnī |
jvālevodyatkirīṭaṁ taraṇivadadharaḥ so'stu śāntyai kṛpābdhiḥ ||"

52. *S.* D., 23.23 :

"vibhradvasrakṣapeśau nayanayugamiṣādbhra śobhāmadabhrām |
śubhraśrīrvaktradambhādadharapaṭarucivyājataḥ sāndhyavelām ||
tiryyagvistīrṇavṛttātulabhujavalayachajñanaścakravālam |
śailaṁ madhyacchalātkāñcanamupacinutādvikhabharttā śubhaṁ naḥ ||"

53. *S. D.*, 23.24 :

"bhūteśo bhūtibhūmirbhavajabhayabharodbhedabhediprabhāvo |
bhūyādbhogīndrabhogābharaṇavapurabhībhāvado bhūta bhūtiḥ ||
bhūbhṛdbhūmīndramaulirbhṛtavarakamalo gaurabhā bheśabhaṁga- |
prabhrājadbhālabhittirvṛṣabharaṇacaṇaḥ satyadabhrābhisandhiḥ ||"

54. *S. D.*, 23.25 :

"sarvāradhyā sitakṣmādhara parama yaśobhūti vikhyati hetu- |
mātā lokasya dūpyanmadhūvadha muditā dityagīta praśastiḥ ||
pātāccaṇḍādidaityābhibhavanakhara ruk candrakāntottamāṁga- |
śrīrasān sarvadomeśvara uditaratiḥ kelikāntāṁga saṁbhṛt ||"

55. *S. D.*, 23.26 :

"śrīmadgaurāmvarāḍamvara rucira payorāśiśityangalakṣī |
raḷakṣmīsenādūtāṁga spuṭatamasa manaḥ saṁgatirvām itāṁghriḥ ||
brahmānandaikabhūmirbhramaśamana paṭūḥ sāśritānāmavidyām |
bhidyāt sthūladehāhītasakala jagaddhrameya sthitirnaḥ ||"

56. *S. D.*, 23.27 :

"hastyodyatpuṣkaraśrīḥ śṛti śikhara dhṛtonmattācittālil'ekho |
alaṁkarttākṣāmamadhya stripuraharatanu dakṣapakṣasya rakṣāt ||
sadyo'vidyāndhakārāt paraśudharapuraskārya durvārya vīryyo |
devaḥ śrīpārvatī vāgvidhi vitatayaśāḥ svargavargāgrapūjyaḥ ||"

57. *S. D.*, 23.28 :

"chāyākāntaḥ kṛtāntārcitacaraṇayugaḥ pāṇirājatsarojaḥ |
svāgrodyadvaineteya rajanī carasu khocchāyāvicchedadakṣaḥ |
svacchānantāṁka līlaḥ kṣayitatamatamāḥ sarvatejo'bhibhāvī |
kālindyānanda kalaḥ pramudita kamalaḥ pātu pakāṁddharirnaḥ ||"

58. *S. D.*, 23.29 :

"chāyākāntaḥ kṛtāntārcita caraṇa yugaḥ pāṇirājat sarojaḥ |
svāgrodyadvaineteyā rajanī carasukhocchāyāvicchedadakṣaḥ ||
svacchānantṁāka līlaḥ kṣayitatamatamāḥ sarvatejo'bhibhāvī |
kālindyānanda kalaḥ pramudita kamalaḥ pātu pakāṁddharirnaḥ ||"

K. S. BEHERA, Bhubaneswar :

TWO SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ACCOUNTS OF KOṆĀRKA TEMPLE

Built in the 13th Century, the Sun Temple of Koṇārka is one of the noblest monuments of India. Over the centuries, legends and traditions have added to the mystery of this magnificent temple, which is now in ruins. The work of collecting historical data on this monument is indeed a difficult task A significant point of which no much idea could be formed was the real condition of the temple in the centuries after its construction. How long the main temple was intact, and when did the worship cease, are matters which remain unsolved. The purpose of this brief article is to throw light on these problems on the basis of two accounts which belong to the 17th century. The first account is based on the *Bahr ul-Asrar,*[1] the travelogue of a foreigner, while the other forms a part of the palm-leaf Oriya chronicle of Jagannāth Temple. Both the accounts supplement each other and constitute valuable sources for the history of the monument in the 17th century.

(A) Account of Mahmud b. Amir Wali in the *Bahr ul-Asrar* :

Mahmud b. Amir Wali was a traveller from Balkh. He proceeded to India in *A.D.* 1624. He visited several places such as Agra, Benaras, Delhi, Patna, Golconda, Bijapur *etc.* He spent six to seven years in India including his stay at Cuttack for about two years. The manuscripts of his travelogue are preserved outside India in the India Office Library, London and at Tashkent. The *Bahr ul-Asrar* has been edited by Riazul ISLAM and published by the Institute of Central and West Asian Studies, University of Karachi, Pakistan.[2]

The author mentions that after witnessing the famous car festival of Jagannāth he proceeded from Khurdā to Koṇārka in the month of *Ramdan* in 1035 *i. e. A.D.* 1626. The English translation of the description of Koṇārka, which is contained in the *Bahr ul-Asrar* is given below :

"Having visited all the wonderful things, we set out to visit the idol House of *Koṇārak*, situated five *krośa* (ten miles) away. We reached there in the evening. We spent that night very uncomfortably. In the morning we visited the temple. According to the Hindus this temple was constructed for the worship of the Sun God. The Hindus regard the Sun as the First *Avatār*. These days Hindus do not worship the Sun God.

For this reason *Koṇārak* (has also been deserted). It is situated near the Bay of Bengal. It is so lofty that once a Mughal who was known for his Worksmanship and physical strength tried to shoot an arrow to hit the top but the arrow could not go beyond the half of the temple's height, and fell down in the sandy ground.

There is a pillar of many coloured marble without joints or insertion, which has also been covered up by sand. And whatever position is visible and apparent is more than fifty *dhara* (cubits). And its gate, the length of which is 10 *dhara*, and width 5 *dhara* is of one iron-piece in which trellis-windows, in three stages and one after another have been provided. And its roof (has been spanned) with 22 iron beams, the length of which is 15 *gaz* and thickness (thereof) is as much as the body of man of medium figure. And its walls are decorated and ornamented with different kinds of paintings and figures. And above it, is an edifice of one piece magnetic stone, approximately 1000 *man* (maunds) in weight.

And from the Europeans, I have repeatedly heard that in this neighbourhood, there has not been spotted any mountain in which magnetic stone is to be found, except in cathay.

In short, when I (obtained pleasure) from the sight seeing of that edifice and also heaps of lesson-taking, the standards of departure and movement having been raised, I set out for golkonda...".

Being an eye-witness account, the short description is more valuable than the account contained in the *Ain-i-Akbari*[3] of Abul Fazal, the famous historian of the court of Akar (1556-1605). According to the description of the monument mentioned above, the Sun God in Koṇārka was not under worship. The temple seems to have been deserted and even the premises around the temple were engulfed by the drifting sand. The lofty temple, however, was standing to a great height. The author was foreign to India and his account cannot be taken too literally. The "pillar of many coloured marble" mentioned by Mahmud b. Amir Wali was obviously the chlorite pillar, called *Aruṇa Stambha* which now stands in front of Jagannātha temple at Puri. Abul Fazal mentioned "an octagonal column of black stone, 50 yards high"[4] at Koṇārka which was confused by Amir Wali as a marble pillar. The use of iron beams in the construction of the temple is corroborated by the discovery of several iron beams at Koṇārka. On the whole the author has given an interesting and trustworthy account of the temple.

(B) Account in the *Mādalāpāñji* or palm-leaf chronicles of *Jagannātha Temple* :

An extract of the *Mādalā Pāñji*, containing interesting information relating to the measurement of Koṇārka temple, was published by M. M. CHAKRAVARTI[5] in 1908. The text, however, is not found in the published version of the *Mādalā Pāñji*.[6] M. M.

CHAKRAVARTI, who was a serious scholar in the field of Orissan history and who spent 17 years in Orissa in an official capacity, must have copied the text from on old and genuine manuscript of the *Mādalā Pāñji*. It is significant to note that "the *list of Ancient Monuments in Bengal, revised and corrected up to 31st August 1895*," contains the following statement with regard to Koṇārka;

"The idol of the Sun God was removed to Puri in the beginning of the 17th century by order of king Narasiṁha Deva. At the time of removal, the King caused a measurement to be made of the main temple and porch, which measurements are noted in the *Mādalā Pāñji*." For the first time CHAKRAVARTI published the relevant portions which are given below

श्री रामचन्द्रदेवमहारायाङ्क नाती पुरुषोत्तमदेवमहारायाङ्क पुत्र श्रीनरसिंहदेवमहारायाए अ१ङ्क मिन दि २१ सप्तमी सोमवार ए देउल देखीवा नीमन्ते श्रीपुरुषोत्तमरु विजे करि याइ देखिले एदिनकु दीलि वादसा साहासेलि वादसाङ्कर होइ ओडीसा सुवा वाखर खा होइथिला—एदमन उपदर्प नीमन्ते मइत्रादित्यवीरञ्चिदेव श्रीपुरुषोत्तमदेउले नीलाद्रीमहोछवदेउले वीये करिथिले। ए महारायाए तुञ्ञादेउल देखीवाकु वीये करि याइ एदेउल मपाइले—आग्यां प्रमाणे श्रीपुरुषोत्तम देउल सुआंसिआ नाथ महापात्र मापि तलप कराइला प्रमाणे ए महारायाङ्क श्रीहस्तरे अं २८ गुले श्रीहस्तकाठि मापरे ए वडदेउलकु ए देउल उपरे चुम्बकलुहाधारणा पोतावाहारे उभारे अछि........ हा १२ ॥ त, ए कपुरिमापकाठि अं२ गुलं ६ ए गेरि क.... ....अलाउपरसिंहठारु गरुडतलसरिकी का १२ ठी। सिंहगरुडतलु पद्मपृष्ठसरिकी काठि ८७ ॥, गाए का ११६ ठी। अं २० गुल हि, लुहाधारणा उभारे अछि काठी हा १२ ॥, देउलवर्तमाने अछि काठी अं १०४ गुल ६, गाए प २ द का ११६ ठी आंगुल २८, ए वाहारे पूर्वरे थिला भांगि अछि कलस ए उपरे पद्मध्वय थिला काठि गाए प २ द का ३ ठि आंगुल ८ गाए प २ द का १२० ठि।

ए देउलरे मुखसाली सानदेउलकु माप का ७३ ठि। ए देउल आकृती आगपाट अगणा पुवपछिमहोइ का १६ ठि आंगुलि ८, उतर दखिण होइ का २३ ठि ए पूर्वकु वर्तमाने अछि पाहाच गो १२ टी ए गो १ टी लम्ब का १३ ठि ८ आगुंल ओसार का २ ठि लेखाए। ए पूर्व दुआर तोरण खम्ब गो १ टी ओसार का ४ ठि लेखाए खम्ब गो २ टी ए खम्बसिरा दिसुअछि गो १७ टी, ए दुआर पाहाच गो ५ टी एथिरि लम्ब का १० ॥। ठि ओसार का २ ठि। दुआर ओसार का ४ठी २ आंगुल पाखे वहमुगुनी पाट गो २ टी गोटिए ओसार का ३ ॥ ठि उश्च का ७ ॥ वहल का० ॥ — ठि [।] मुखसाली देउल दुइखम्ब मझो ओसार का ६ ॥ ठि ए खम्ब ओसार का ५ ठि लेखाए दुइखम्ब ओसार का १० ठि, एखम्ब उतारु दुइ पाआभाग ए पाआभग गो १ टी का ७ ॥ ठि लेखाए गो २ टी का १५ ठि, गाए मुखसाली देउल ओसार का २८ ॥— ठी। एवाड वहल का ८ ठि लेखाए दुइ वाडकु का १६ ठि। गाए मुखसाली सानदेउल ओसार वाडमध्यकरि

का ४५ ।— [।] वडदेउलर अणसरपिण्डी उतर दखिण कान्थ ओसार का ६ ठि । पूर्वपछिम होइ लम्ब का १० ठि ४ आंगुल, दुआर ठारु उतर पाहाचतल एरण्डा याए का ५७ ठि । भितर दुआर ओसार का ३ ठि २६ आंगुल ए उच्च का ७ ।।।, ए दुइ पाट वले काठि ।।— लेखाए एपाट ओसार का ३ ।— लेखाए भितर गम्भिरा पूर्वपछिम होइ लम्ब का १८ ठि । उतर दखिण होइ का १८ ठि ८ आंगुल [।] सिंहासन लम्ब का ७ ठि ओसार का ५ ।।—ठि एउठ का २ ।।। ठि, ए उपरसिंहासन गो १ टी लम्ब का ३ ठि आठ आंगुलि ओसार का २ ठि उच्च का १ ठि [।] अरुणखम्ब मोट का ३ ।।। ठि उच्चमाप काठि । उतर वाड़पादुकनला वाड ओसार का १८ ठि । दखोण वाडओसार का १८ ठि । गाए दुइवाड़ ओसार का ३६ ठि । देउल पछिमवाड ओसार का १८ ठि । भीतर दुआर ठारु तल पाहाचसरिकी वढ़ल का १२ ठि । ए प्रकारे माप होइला ।

It is known from the above mentioned text that Mahārāja Narasiṁha Deva, grandson of Mahārāja Rāma Candra Deva and son of Mahārāja Puruṣottama Deva, came from Puri to see the temple of Koṇārka in the 9th *Aṁka* of his reign on the 21st day of the month of *Mīna* on a Monday which coincided with the 7th *tithi*. At that time Bākhar Khān was governing the Subah of Orissa under Shahseli Badshah (Salim, Jahangir), the emperor of Delhi. Because of the atrocity of this *Damana* (*Yavana*), the idol of the Sun God called Maitrāditya Virañcideva, had been removed to *Nilādri-Mahotsava* temple situated within the enclosure of *Puruṣottama* temple. The Mahārāja saw the empty temple and got it measured through one Nātha Mahāpātra. For taking the measurement, a *Kāṭhi* (Measuring stick) was used which was equal in length to 28 *aṅgulas* (finger width of King Narasiṁha Deva). The measurements of the *Baḍa Deula* (sanctuary), *mukhaśālā* (porch) and *Aruṇa Stambha* are mentioned in the manuscript. The details of the measurements are not systematic, possibly because the person entrusted was not experienced for the job. But in spite of its defects, it gives a general idea about the height of the temple. When the measurements were taken the *Kalaśa* and the Lotus finial (*padmadhvaja*) of the main temple had been broken but the iron rod called *cumbaka luhā dhāraṇa*, which projected above the temple was still in position. The height of the main temple from the *padma pṛṣṭha*, as given in the document, was 120 *kāṭhis*, this height also included the conjectural height of the missing *kalaśa* and the Lotus finial. If we take one *Kāṭhi* to be equal to 1 ft. 9 inches, 120 *kāṭhis* would correspond to 210 ft. It is not known what is meant by the term *padma pṛṣṭha*. If it is identical with upper *piṣṭa* of the main temple, the height of the main temple from the ground level would be 226 ft. 6 inches; the added height of 16 ft. 6 inches being the combined height of the first and second plinth which are now extant.

Mahārāja Narasiṁha Deva, mentioned in the text, belonged to the royal family of Khurdā[7]. He ruled from 1621 to 1647. The date of his visit to Koṇārka temple corresponds to March 17, 1628. According to Swami Kānnu Pillai[8] *Saptami*

fell on a Monday on the 20th day of *Mīna* corresponding to March 17, 1628, and not on the 21st day of *Mīna* as mentioned in the manuscript. Thus there is a difference of only one day which could be due to the mistake in the calculation of *tithi* or variation of time in the sunrise. The coincidence of astronomical details is a further proof of the importance of the text. As Jahangir died on October 28, 1627, the statement of the manuscript that Jahangir was emperor in 1628 is obviously a mistake. But we cannot expect anything better from an ordinary priest. Moreover, the coronation of Shah Jahan took place in February 4, 1628, and it is not surprising therefore that on March 17, 1628, the compiler of the *Mādalā Pāñji* was ignorant of it. Bakhar Khan of the text is no other than Baquer Khan Naja Sani, who was one of the most oppressive Mughal Subahdars of Orissa. J. N. SARKAR, on the basis of *Masir-ul-Umara* has given an account of his oppression over peasants and Zamindars[9]. The *Bahr ul-Asrar* also gives the name of the governor as Baquire Khan who was the son of Mustafa Beg.

A study of the extract of the *Mādalā Pāñji* reveals that on the date of Narasiṁha's visit *i. e.* on March 17, 1628 *A. D.*, the main temple was empty The *Kalaśa* of the temple had been dislodged either under the impression of being gold (*Kanaka Kalaśa*) or in the belief of containing jewels. The *cumbaka luhā dhāraṇā* of the temple gave rise to the legend of the magnet on the temple. The *Bahr ul-Asrar* and the *Mādalā Pāñji* certainly suggest that there temple was not under worship. The *Mādalā Pāñji* suggests that in 1628 *A. D.* the tower of the main temple existed with all the component parts except *Kalaśa* and *padma-dhvaja*.

REFERENCES

1. D. N. MARSHAL, *Mughals in India : A Bibliographical Survey*, p.279.
2. *The Bahr ul-Asrar*, Introduced, Edited and annotated by Riazual ISLAM, University of Karachi, 1980.
3. H. S. JARRETT and Jadunath SARKAR, *Ain-i-Akbari*, Vol-II, (Calcutta, 1949) pp. 140-141
4. *Ibid*, p.141.
5. *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal* N. S., IV (1908), pp 322 *f.*
6. A. B. MOHANTI, ed., *Mādalā Pāñji*, Praci publication, Cuttack, 1940.
7. K. N. MAHAPATRA, *History of Khurda*, (Oriya), pp 77-92.
8. S. K. PILLAI, *Indian Ephemeris* Vol. VI, p.58.
9. J. N. SARKAR, *Studies in Mughal India*, p.203.

K. B. TRIPATHI, Cuttack :

EDITING OF INSCRIPTIONS

Inscriptions speak to us directly whereas manuscripts speak to us through intermediaries since these come down to us through copyists from time to time. In the latter case the writing of the original authors is sometimes distorted unknowingly by those who copy the manuscripts. Language changes gradually, and after a few centuries some words and phrases become unintelligible. So in the place of these unfamiliar expressions, copyists substitute sometimes, knowingly, familiar ones. In case of ordinary works additions are also made. Take the example of Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*. The editions or the recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* published at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras differ with regard to one third of their text. The *Rāmāyaṇa* consists of 24,000 ślokas. Of these, there is difference in respect of 8000 ślokas. Had the *Rāmāyaṇa* been inscribed on copper plates or on stone slabs, we could have an authentic edition of Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Inscriptions may be broadly divided into two categories namely Metalic and Lithic (lithic). The usual metal used in inscriptions is copper, and the usual stone used in inscriptions is some type of hard rock, the surface of which can be polished and engraved. Of the metalic and lithic inscriptions the latter, are more numerous. These also come down from higher antiquity. But clay-tablets with small inscriptions such as those discovered from Mahenzodaro and Harappa may be taken as a third category of inscriptions.

The legend of coins also help us in the chronology of past kings. The bilingual coins of Indo-Greek princes supplied the clue for deciphering the inscriptions of Aśoka engraved in *Brāhmī* script.

Some of the oldest inscriptions of the world are :

1. the big stone tablet inscription of king Hamurabi (2123 B.C.-2081 B.C.) at Susain Persia,

2. the Boghaz-Koi inscriptions of the kings of Mitani (1400 B. C.) of Kappadoia in Asia Minor,

3. the Bahishan Rock inscription & the old Persian Block tablet at Persepolis of king Darius in Persia (522-486 B.C.) 520 B. C. to 515 B.C,

4. The stone inscriptions of Aśoka found in the Indian sub-continent & Afganistan (4th century B.C.),

5. The bilingual (Egyptian & Greek) Rosetta Stone inscription in Hieroglyphic & Demotic[1] scripts and old Greek Script discovered from Egypt, now in British Museum, London, (200 B. C.),

6. Hātīgumphā inscription of king Khāravela (1st Century B. C.),

7. Allahabad Stone Pillar inscription of Samudragupta (4th century A. D.),

These ancient inscriptions have been deciphered by Paleographists and Linguists after a great deal of perseverence, spreading over a long time. In some of their readings there are still points of doubt chiefly owing to the drying condition of the engraving material.

The inscribed seals of Harappa and Mahenjodaro discovered in 1921-22 have not yet been deciphered by scholars of the world.

In Orissa, besides the Rock Edicts of Aśoka found in Dhauligiri near Bhubaneswar, and in Jaugada near Purusottamapur in Ganjam, and the above mentioned Khāravela inscription, there are a large number of inscriptions in sanskrit and in Oriya. Some inscriptiong *e. g.* the taerly big inscription perhaps in Pali engraved at the back of the Buddhist image at Udayagiri near Rāmagiri have not yet been deciphered.

As regards Sanskrit inscriptions of Orissa I have edited three only (one being with the help of Dr. N. Pradhan). These are :

1. The Banpur Copper-plate Charter of King Indrarath (of Soma Vamia) (3 Plates) published in J.A.S., Calcutta (see also Utkalknir. Journal Vol. I)

2. Ganjam copper-plate inscription of Udayakhedi (3 Plates).

3. Deoga (Keonjhar) copper-plate of Ranabhanj II (one copper-plate) (loaned by Dr. N. P.) published in *Jhaṁkāra*.

While editing metrical inscriptions, one must be familiar not only with the concerned script, ephemeris, and language but with the rules of metre.

---

1. Demotic is a cursive form of Hieroglyphic-script.

My main work, however, has been one old Oriya epigraply (1051 *A.D.* to 1568 *A.D.*). In my thesis published by the Utkal University under the title of *The Evaluation of Oriya Language & Script*, I have tried to show the features of the Oriya language on the basis of 71 inscriptions all most all of which I have deciphered from facsimilies. The oldest inscription of the series namely Urajam (stone) inscription and the Kondavidu hill Oriya inscription, have been published for the first time. Two copper-plate inscriptions from Nellore District (one of which was supposed to be granted by Kākatīya king Pratāparudra) have been correctly deciphered and ascribed to their proper donors—the orissan monarch and his son. In these two epigraphs, the preamble is engraved in Oriya (sometimes with Telugu case-endings), and the royal donors' address is recorded in Telugu. The donors are king Pratāparudra of Orissa and his son Vīrabhadra (the Governor of Tamil Districts of the formers' empire). Both these inscriptions are engraved in Telugu script.

As regards the remaining 69 inscriptions of the Thesis, the texts previously published have been corrected, and supplemented. In one Puri Jagannāth temple inscription,

R. Mitra read about 1872 *A.D.* 'nigigiri bibho Jagannāth'

M. M. Chakravarti read about 1892 *A. D.* 'niyogibi bho Jagannātha'

The writer read in 1951 *A. D.* 'nigiribibi bho Jagaranātha'

Eng. Trans. :— I shall punish, Oh ! Jagannātha.

In the Bhubaneswar bilingual (Tamil-Oriya) inscription published by several scholars since its discovery 60 years ago, Line 16 of the Oriya version contains the reading एकहति offered by Dr. Sircar. It is the correct reading in place of the previous reading एकउहि . The Narasiṁhanātha temple inscription (Appendix 4 of the Thesis) closes with a wellknown imprecatory verse. But for the last hundred years, both in private and Orissa Government publications, fanciful reading persists in its place. Whole inscriptions (*e. g.* No. 3 and 8 in the Appendix of the Thesis) as previously published in India Govt. publication, hardly offered any meaning. In the readings of the Thesis, these become meaningful.

On the whole, the editing of an inscription is an arduous task. Ordinarily there are no punctuation marks from start to finish, and the letters chiselled or engraved do not exhibit their full forms. The more antiquatedisan inscription, the more difficult is its deciphering. Scholarship in historical linguistics & paleography is essential for an epigraphist.

N. K. BEHURA, Bhubaneswar :

STRUCTURALISM AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Social Anthropology arose as a general movement in nineteenth century philosophic thought. A peculiar property of this movement was the attempt to fuse organicism and positivism—two philosophic forms that had ordinarily been in conflict. This peculiar combination implemented the penetration of the scientific point of view into the study of social phenomena. Nineteenth century philosophers, such as, SPENCER, COMTE, Saint SIMON and others achieved success in formulating a distinct domain of the socio-cultural phenomena. This intellectual tradition culminated in the rise of French Sociological School, which began in the nineteenth century with Emil DURKHEIM as its most outstanding exponent.

Implicit in DURKHEIM's approach is the holistic idea that societies are not just aggregates of human beings, but are well organised systems with built-in dynamic mechanisms, very much similar to living organisms. However, modern anthropologists do not regard societies as being only systems, but as "having structures". The term "social structure" is used by social anthropologists and sociologists, with reference to "a set of problems that have to do mainly with the description, analysis, and ultimate analysis of social life" (NUTINI, 1965 : 709).

Being impressed by DURKHEIM's apotheosis of social solidarity, Radcliffe-BROWN took to intensive field studies among small-scale simple societies and analysed the data from the view point of synchronic functional relations. He introduced the concept of 'social structure' in anthropology. By social structure he referred to the inter-relation or arrangement of parts in some total entity or 'whole'. He defined social structure as consisting of human beings not as organisms but as persons occupying positions in social structure. For Radcliffe-BROWN, the components of social structure are human beings, the structure itself being an arrangement of persons in relationships institutionally defined and regulated (1952 : 9). EVANS-PRITCHARD restricts social structure to the inter-relations of groups explicitly excluding interpersonal relations (1940 : 262). For FORTES elements of social structure are interpersonal relations which are reached through abstracting the constant features in the pattern of organization of all activities in which the relation is significant. FIRTH thinks of social structure as ordered relations of parts to a whole with the arrangement in which the elements of the social life are linked together. These relations are built up one upon another in a series of

varying orders of complexity. He states that "social structure stresses not so much the actual relations between persons or groups as the expected relations, or even the ideal relations" (1956 : 30). NADEL says that the structure of a society is arrived at by "abstracting from the concrete population and its behaviour the pattern or network (or system) of relationships obtaining between actors in their capacity of playing roles relative to one another" (1958 : 12). LEVI-STRAUSS per contram maintains that social structure can by no means be reduced to the ensemble of social relations to be described in a given society.

LEVI-STRAUSS' approach to the study of social-structure is substantially different, unique and an improved one. His concept of social structure is an explanatory method which can be applied to any kind of social study. He says that "the object of social-structure studies is to understand social relations with the help of models (1953 : 532). He says that the terms 'social structure' has nothing to do with empirical reality, but with models which are built up after it" (1953 : 525). He thus makes a categorical distinction between the concepts of social structure and social relations. As such, social structure belongs to a different epistemological category, and can never, be reduced to the ensemble of the social relations to be described in a given society" (1953 : 525). Social relations are raw data of social experience, out of which model or models comprising the social structure are built.

In the application of structural analysis, says LEVI-STRAUSS, one must distinguish between observation and experimentation, and between the conscious and unconscious character of the models involved. Observation and experimentation represent two different levels of the same process, the former always taking precedence over the latter. "There should be a direct relationship between the levels of observation and experimentation, or between 'the concreteness of ethnographic detail' and the models constructed after it, for, in the final analysis, the best model is that which accounts for all of the observed facts" (NUTINI, 1965 : 708).

LEVI-STRAUSS makes a distinction between conscious and unconscious structural models, and this distinction "is a matter of degree and not one of categorical differences" as they are defined with reference "to society and not to the anthropologist who studies society" (*ibid.*). By conscious models he refers to "home-made models according to which the society regulates itself. These are usually termed as ***norms***, which remain at the "collective consciousness" of the members of a society as a screen, concealing a deeper and more transcendental structure. On the other hand unconscious models are those which lie at a great depth and are not consciously perceived by the society. LEVI-STRAUSS maintains that it is generally more profitable for the anthropologist to work with models when he has elicited and constructed out of these deeper-lying phenomena—that is, with unconscious models—than with conscious models or

norms, since by definition "they are not intended to explain the phenomena but perpetuate them" (1953 : 527). Some of the home-made models may be more accurate than those which could be built by the anthropologist; and hence the conscious models cannot be done away with while analyzing the structure of a society even if they are inaccurate, because they provide an insight into the nature of the deeper structure and "the very errors are part of the social facts under study" (NUTINI, 1965 : 709).

LEVI-STRAUSS' important contribution to the theory of social structure is the distinction and factual implication between "mechanical models" and "statistical models". Here LEVI-STRAUSS introduces the concept of scale and measurement of phenomena. Models on the same scale as phenomena are called "mechanical" by him, and those on a different scale than the phenomena are called "statistical". LEVI-STRAUSS means by "on the same scale as", says NUTINI, "the differential quantitative elements involved in the construction of the models" (1965 : 709). LEVI-STRAUSS does not precisely define the two types of models; rather he illustrates them through examples. "In primitive societies these laws can be expressed in models calling for actual grouping of the individuals according to kin or clan; these are mechanical models". And on the contrary, "No such distribution exists in our own society, where types of marriage are determined by the size of the primary and secondary groups to which prospective mates belong, social fluidity, amount of information, and the like. A satisfactory (though yet untried) attempt to formulate the invariants of our marriage system, would therefore, have to determine the average values-thresholds; it would be statistical model" (1969 : 284).

Treatment of structures as models increases the importance of social structure studies. If structures are models, their formal properties can be compared independently of their elements. The task of the structuralist is "to recognize and isolate levels of reality which have strategic value from his point of view, namely, which admit of representation as models, whatever their type. It often happens that the same data may be considered from different perspectives embodying equally strategic values, though the resulting models will be in some cases mechanical and in others statistical" 1969 : 284).

"Edmund LEACH has expressed very similar views on the nature of social structure. Being stimulated by LEVI-STRAUSS, LEACH 'bifurcates' the 'social universe' into different epistemological categories : the raw data of social experience, and the models that are constructed from it. He says that "the structures which the anthropologist describes" are "models which exist only as logical constructions in his mind" (1954 : 5). Further he says that structures "provide us with an idealized model which states the 'correct' status relations between groups... ... ... and ... ... social persons" (1954 : 9). For him social structure consists of a set of ideas about the distribution of

power between persons or groups of persons (1954 : 4). Like LEVI-STRAUSS, LEACH denies the empirical reality of the models. And according to him the structural analysis of the anthropologist and the rituals of the people are both idealized abstractions, attempts to impose an as if, fictional but comprehensible order upon the flux of social life. Beneath those attempts at formalization lies the reality of individuals in pursuit of power, and in this continual competition, the actors make a series of choices which collectively may alter the structure of their society.

Structural analysis has acquired greatest significance in linguistics amongst all social science. "It is probably the only one which can truely claim to be a science and which has achieved both the formulation of an empirical method and an understanding of the nature of the data submitted in its analysis" (LEVI-STRAUSS, 1969 : 31). The advent of structural linguistics has renovated methods of analysis in many social sciences. N. TROUBETZKOY, the illustrious founder of structural linguistics, in one programmatic statement reduced the structural method to four basic operations : first, structural linguistics shifts from the study of conscious linguistic phenomena to study of their unconscious infrastructure; second, it does not treat terms as independent entities, taking instead as its basis of analysis the relations between terms; third, it introduces the concept of system—"Modern phonemics does not merely proclaim that phonemes are always part of a system; it shows concrete phonemic systems and elucidates their structure"—; finally, structural linguistics aims at discovering general laws, either by induction "or ... ... by logical deduction. which would give them an absolute character" (LEVI-STRAUSS, 1969 : 33).

The above statement emphasizes the fact that Linguistics is in a position to formulate relationships between the phenomena under its analysis. Having witnessed this sort of renovation in one of the sciences of man, social anthropology, the master science of man, has slowly but steadily taken to structuralism as a heuristic and explanatory tool.

In the study of kinship problems the anthropologist finds himself in a position which resembles that of the structural linguist. Kinship terms, like phonemes, are elements of meaning and they acquire meaning only, if they are integrated into systems. 'Kinship Systems' and 'Phonemic systems' are similar in the sense that both are built by the mind on the level of unconscious thought. As such, "in the case of kinship as well as linguistics, the observable phenomena result from the action of laws which are general but implicit..... although they belong to another order of reality, kinship phenomena are of the same type as linguisteic phenomena" (LEVI-STRAUSS, 1969 : 34). And the anthropologist, using a method analogous in form (not in content of course) to the method used in structural linguistics, has achieved progress in the direction of generalisation.

Transfer of the phonological method to the study of kinship necessitates assimilation of Kinship terms to the phonemes of language from the point of view of their formal treatment. In order to obtain a law of structure, the linguist analyses phonemes into "differential elements", which then becomes possible to organize them into one or more "pairs of oppositions" (JACOBSON cited in LEVI-STRAUSS 1969). The anthropologist can analyze the kinship terms of a given system taking components into consideration, for instance, "father" in a patrilineal society is characterized positively with regard to sex (+male), relative age (+older), generation (+ascending), lineality (+ lineal), and it cannot express affinity or collaterality. "Thus, for each system, one might ask what relationships are expressed, and for each term of the system, what connotation — positive or negative — it carries regarding each of the following relationships : generation, collaterality, sex, relative age, affinity, *etc*." (LEVI-STRAUSS, 1969 : 35). LEVI-STRAUSS asserts that at this "microsociological" stage it is possible to detect the general laws of structure, just as the linguist discovers his at the infra-phonemic level the distinctive features (*viz*. free variation, contrastive distribution and complementary distribution).

However, there is a profound difference between the table of phonemes of a language and the table of kinship terms of a society. Phonology of a language constitutes a system which facilitates communication. Likewise, kinship terms symbolize relationships, and the individuals, who use them, are under social obligations to adhere to culturally determined mode of conduct with regard to each other, such as, right or duty, familiarity or restraint, avoidance or joking, affection or hostility and the like. Kinship systems consist of two orders of reality, *viz* . the "system of appellations" and the "system of attitude". The "system of appellations" does not reflect the "system of attitudes" uniformly in all societies. There are institutionalised attitudes as well as not institutionalised attitudes in each society Hence it is necessary to distinguish the diffuse, uncrystallized and not instituationalized behaviours from obligatory, sanctioned and socially imperative ones. LEVI-STRAUSS writes that attitudes are secondary elaborations meant to resolve contradictions inherent in the system of appellations (1969 : 37). In this connection a formal transposition of the method of structural linguistics allows the anthropologist to shed new light upon this problem. This can be illustrated through the example of the avunculate. The importance of avunculate does not have a positive correlation with matrilineal system. It is associated with both patrilineal and matrilineal system. "The role of the maternal uncle cannot be explained as either a consequence or a survival of matrilineal kinship; it is only a specific application of a very general tendency to associate definite social relations with definite forms of kinship regardless of maternal or peternal side" (LEVI-STRAUSS 1969 : 40). LEVI-STRAUSS asserts that "the avuncular relation is not a relation in two, but in four terms : it assumes a brother, a sister, a brother-in-law, and a nephew" (1964 : 45). The four relationships which obtain between these terms comprise a global structure upon

which larger social super structures rest. The elements of this universal structure constitute dialectically two pairs of binary relations. In other words the basic global structure constitutes a topological set. "Society is not an assemblage of things but an assemblage of variables" (LEACH : 1961). LEACH maintains that "if we apply ideas of topology to sociology we cease to be interested in particular relationships and concern ourselves instead with the regularities of pattern among neighbouring relationships" (1961).

For illustration it is necessary to examine some of the social systems. The society of the Trobriand Islanders of Melanesia is matrilineal, and there is free and familiar relations between father and son, and antagonism between maternal uncle and nephew. Among the Trobrianders the relationship between husband and wife is intimate and reciprocal; and on the other hand relations between brother and sister are marked by rigid taboo (MALINOWSKI, 1929). In contrast to this among the Cherkess of the Caucasus there is hostility between father and son ; whereas the maternal uncle assists his nephew and sends him presents. Among the Cherkess the brother-sister relationship is quite tender; but the relationship between spouses is one of indifference (cited in LEVI-STRAUSS, 1969).

Understanding of the structure of the societies of the Cherkess and Trobriand necessitates a correlative analysis of the attitudes between all the four sets of relationships within the micro-global structure, *viz*. brother/sister, husband/wife, father/son, and mother's brother/sister's son. Out of the analysis of these two societies a law can be formulated which runs as follws : "In both groups, the relation between maternal uncle and nephew is to the relation between brother and sister as the relation between husband and wife. Thus if we know one pair of relations, it is always possible to infer the other" (LEVI-STRAUSS, 1969 : 42).

Among the patrilineal Tonga of Polynesia descent is patrilineal. Relations between husband and wife is harmonious, although the former exercises authority in all domestic matters; whereas the relationship between a married woman and her brother is one of severe restraint. A person exercises a great deal of freedom on his mother's brother; but he is never free with his father; he cannot share his father's food and drink, and is even forbidden from touching the latter's head (GIFFORD cited in LEVI-STRAUSS).

The Siuai of Bougainville are matrilineal people. The relationship between brother and sister is one of cordiality and mutuality. Between husband and wife harmonious understanding is rare. Likewise the relationship between the nephew and his mother's brother varies between stern discipline and genial mutual dependence. A boy

normally stands in awesome respect towards his mother's brother. In contrast to this the term 'father' does not evoke images of hostility or stern authority or awed respect (Oliver cited in LEVI-STRAUSS).

Trobriand — Matrilineal	Cherkess — Patrilineal
Siuai — Matrilineal	Tonga — Patrilineal

From the above examples LEVI-STRAUSS concludes that the contemporary method of analysis, *i. e.* establishment of a patterned correlation between types of descent and forms of avunculate does not subsume generalization. LEVI-STRAUSS holds that "different forms of avunculate can coexist with the same type of descent, whether patrilineal or matrilineal. But we constantly find the same fundamental relationship between the four pairs of oppositions required to construct the system" (1969 : 44). The +sign stands for free and familiar relations, and the - sign indicates hostility, antagonism or restraint. Although this is an over-simplification, it can be used to rid the discipline of value-loaded analysis. LEVI-STRAUSS maintains that the synchronic law of correlation may be validated diachronically.

From the above analysis it clearly transpires that in order to understand the avunculate one must treat it as one relationship within a system, while the system itself must be considered as a whole in order to grasp its structure. "This structure rests upon four terms (brother, sister, father and son), which are linked by two pairs of correlative oppositions in such a way that in each of the two generations there is always a positive relationship and a negative one.........This structure is the most elementary form of kinship that can exist. It is, properly speaking, the unit of Kinship" (LEVI-STRAUSS, 1969 : 46).

Structural Analysis of Myth :

In order to understand the nature of myth, one has to choose between platitude and sophism, because some claim that human societies simply express, through their mythology, "fundamental feelings common to the whole of mankind, such as love, hate or revenge or that they try to provide some kind of explanations for phenomena which they cannot otherwise understand—astronomical, meteorological, and the like" (LEVI-STRAUSS, 1969 : 207).

Mythology often reflects the social structure and social relations; and sometimes it provides an outlet for repressed feelings. Myths may appear to be contradictory at first sight and without any logic or continuity; but it is not true. There is astounding similarity between myths available throughout the world. The apparent antinomy in

the nature of myths provides a scope for their solution. The discovery of the dichotomy between sounds and meanings in structural linguistics holds a clue to this problem. There is no one-to-one correlation between a unit of sound and its meaning; the relationship between them is an arbitrary one. If one realises that it is the combination of the sounds, and not the sounds themselves, which provides the significant data for analysis, then the contradiction can be surmounted.

LEVI-STRAUSS studied the structure of myths, and he recognized myth as a product of language, and therefore, like language, myth is also made up of constituent units. If language is made up of phonemes, morphemes and the like, myth is also made up of similar but not identical elements whose "special properties are to be found only above the ordinary linguistic level" (HENDRICKS, 1875 : 17). Myths, according to LEVI-STRAUSS, are offsprings of "collective and unconscious fancying, and for this reason he seeks in it an immediate reflection of universal mental structures in the anatomy of the human mind" (cited in MELETINSKY, 1971 : 65).

LEVI-STRAUSS believes that, like language, if there is a meaning to be found in mythology it cannot reside in the isolated elements of a myth, but only in the way those elements are combined. He calls such elements as "gross constituent elements" or "mythemes" which can be looked at the sentence level, although true constituent units of a myth may not be individual isolated sentences, but "classes of sentences". Sentences, combined together in this manner, exhibit some common feature of meaning. The implication is that in a myth, a sentence in isolation cannot render any meaning unless it is functionally integrated to other sentences of the same myth. Myth, though is an oral narrative, has a complex pattern, and hence should be read as a whole. The technique involves grouping of the sentences of a myth into columns and determination of the feature of meaning shared by the sentences in each column. Like an orchestra score a myth manifests harmony, and like the former it must be read diachronically along one axis, "that is, page after page and from left to right—and synchronically on the other axis; all the notes written vertically making up one gross constituent unit, that is one bundle of relations" (LEVI-STRAUSS, 1969 : 212).

LEVI-STRAUSS has made structural analysis of the famous Greek myth of Oedipus.

Here the LEVI-STRAUSSIAN method will be tested in respect of a Tamil myth.

Koovalan, born of merchant parents in a wealthy port city, was married to beautiful Kannaki, who too is of rich parents. On the wedding day or soon there after Koovalan was attracted by a beautiful dancing girl named Mathavi, and went to live with her in another town. In the company of the dancing girl Koovalan completely

forgot his wife Kannaki. Kannaki pining for her husband in loneliness, discarded her ornaments, and sorrows became her only adoration. Koovalan lost his enormous wealth on Mathavi. Mathavi's innocent jest in a song during a festival made Koovalan suspect her fidelity. Already impoverished he returned to Kannaki. Both Kannaki and Koovalan decided to leave the city of Madras in order to regain their fortune. Reaching the outskirts of Madurai town, Koovalan left Kannaki under the protection of a shepherdess and proceeded to the city to sell one of his wife's anklets, so that they can start afresh. There he met the goldsmith of the royal household. This goldsmith, who had stolen the queen's anklets sometime back, immediately planned to deceive Koovalan. He seized of the opportunity to accuse Koovalan of the theft of the queen's anklet, and thus proved himself to be innocent. He informed the king, and Koovalan became a victim of the deceit perpetrated on him by the goldsmith. The king without investigation ordered capital punishment, and Koovalan was unjustly killed. This shocking news reached Kannaki. Distraught with grief she rushed to the palace and found Koovalan dead. She wailed and wailed until she seemed to see Koovalan rise up to the heaven saying to her "stay here". All her grief turned into wrath. She resolved to prove the innocence of her husband and avenge his death. She proved the innocence of her husband by breaking open the other half of the anklet pair, and demonstrated to the king his tragic error. The king died broken-hearted, and the queen followed her lord. Kannaki tore off her left breast, and threw it on the city which was destroyed by fire. She climbed a hill top where Koovalan descended, and took her to heaven in his celestial chariot.

For making a structural study of any myth, LEVI-STRAUSS says that it is necessary at the first step, to break down the story of the myth on the basis of its features into "shortest possible sentences", and write "each sentence on an index card bearing a number corresponding to the unfolding of story" (LEVI-STRAUSS, 1969 : 211). And then the cards be arranged in columns on the basis of their common features like a musical score. LEVI-STRAUSS does it this way : 1, 2, 4, 4, 8, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, . 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 1, 2, 5, 7, ; and 3, 4, 5, 6, 8. The numbers are vertically common and horizontally sequential.

1	2		4			7	8
	2	3	4		6		8
1			4	5		7	8
1	2			5		7	
		3	4		6		8

I	II	III	IV
1. Koovalan marries Kannaki.			
2. Koovalan falls in love with Courtesan Mathavi.			
			3. Koovalan forgets his wife for Mathavi.
			4. Koovalan becomes impoverished for the strumpet.
			5. Koovalan suspects Mathavi of infidelity.
6. Koovalan returns to Kannaki.			
7. Koovalan wants to sell his wife's anklet for revival of family life.			
			8. Koovalan is deceived by the royal goldsmith.
	9. King kills Koovalan.		
		10. Kannaki resolves to avenge the death of her husband.	
		11. She demonstrates the other anklet and exposes the king of his tragic error.	
	12. Both king and queen die.		
	13. Kannaki throws her left breast to destroy the town.		
14. Koovalan descends from heaven to take Kannaki along with him.			

By carrying out the above operation we have delineated the basic structure of the myth. The myth is divided into four columns, each of which consists of units or mythemes exhibiting common features. The units or mythemes grouped under columns comprise two pairs of binary opposition and exhibit events which involve a man or a woman, column-I stands for a sense of 'togetherness' of a man and a woman, the inevitable precondition of life or creation, and thus the common feature of this column is—'life.' The second column exhibits a feature which is the contrary of the first, that is, 'death.' Life is to be created for the ongoing process of human social life, but life has always its inevitable corollary, *i. e.* 'death.' This is amply demonstrated by the last mytheme of column-II : , "Kannaki throws her left breast and destroyes the town". This pehnomenon exhibits the element of binary opposition, that is, the left is opposed to the right, and when left has the potentiality of destruction, right has the powers of creation—one symbolises *death*, and the other life.

The common features of column-III exhibits 'gain' or 'hope.' For example, Kannaki resolves to avenge the death of her husband, and thereby tries to retrieve the loss of truth, and she regains it by displaying the other anklet. In contrast to this the mythemes of the fourth column depict facts of *Loss* or *despair*.

Thus the myth comprises of two pairs of opposed elements, *viz.* :

Column-I : Life
Column-II Death
Column-III : Gain
Column-IV : Loss

Therefore, the opposition here is 'life' to 'death' as 'gain to 'loss' as 'life' is to 'gain' and 'loss' is to 'death.' Hence, the myth tries to solve the paradox of 'life' and 'death' in the cycle of 'hope' and 'despair.'

REFERENCES

BECK, B.E.F., 1971 : *The study of 'Tamil Epic : Several, variousof Silappadikoram compared*. (mimeographed). St. John's, Canada.

EGGAN, F., 1950 : *Social Organization of the Western Pueblo*, Chicago.

Evans—Prit—CHARD, E.E., 1940 : *The Nuer*, Oxford.

FORTH, R., 1956 : *Elements of Social Organization London* : Watts & Co.

FORTES, M., 1949 : *The Web of Kinship Among the Tallensi.*

HANDOO, J., 1976 : "Levi-Strauss and Structural Folkloristico", *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics*, Vol.V, No.1, Trivandrum,

HENDRICKS, W.O., 1973 : *Essays on Semiolingustics and Verbal Art*, Paris : Mouton.

LEVI-STRAUSS, C., 1969 : "The Structural Study of Myth", *Structural Anthropology*, Great Britain : Hazalwatson and Viney Ltd.

MALINOWSKI, B., 1929 : *The Sexual Life of Savages in North Western Malanesia*, London.

MALETINSKY, Y., 1971 : "The Structural Typological Study of Folklore" *Social Sciences*, Vol.3, Moscow, Academy of Sciences.

NADAL, S.F., *Theory of Social structure.*

R. C. Mishra, Puri :

THE EXTANT ATHARVA VEDA ŚĀKHĀS AND THEIR AREA OF CIRCULATION

Though the number of *Atharva Veda* (*AV*) *śākhās* mentioned in different texts varies from five to hundred, the most accepted number is nine (Patañjali : *Paspaśāhnika navadhā ātharvaṇa* , *AV pariśiṣṭa* 49, *Śaunakīya Caraṇa Vyuha*, *Kātyāyana Pariśiṣṭa-dasakam*). Sāyaṇa in his introduction to the *AV bhāṣya* and others testify that *AV* has nine *śākhās*. The *śākhā* names are differently written in different texts, sometimes with slight Variations but sometimes they are altogether new. But the most correct in so far as the number and names are concerned seems to be the information found in *AV Pariśiṣṭa 49.4.1*. The nine names given there are :—*Paippalādāḥ, Staudāḥ, Maudāḥ, Śaunakīyāḥ, jājalāḥ, jaladāḥ, Brahmavadāḥ, Devadarśāḥ, Caraṇavaidyāḥ*. This text belongs to the *AV* tradition, and so, its information should be accepted as authentic. The other texts do not belong to the *AV* tradition proper. On this subject much has been written by scholars. So I don't want to linger on it. The remark I want to make is that the *Paippalāda śākhā* and the *Śaunaka śākhā*, are common in all the enumerations and it is remarkable that only these two *śākhās* are known to be extant at present. But I feel that a third *śākhā i. e.* the *Devadarśī* is perhaps extant also. So I shall confine my discussion regarding the circulation of these three *śākhās* only *i. e.* the *Śaunaka*, the *Paippalāda* and the *Devadarśī*.

The *Śaunaka śākhā* :

This *śākhā* is widely known to the scholars at present. Most of the important texts of it are published. Among the *śākhās* of the *AV*, it is considered as Vulgate by the scholars. The *AV* tradition seems to be fully maintained in the *śākhā*.

Now, coming to the area of its circulation we feel that the information known so far is inadequate. So I humbly try to give more information on the basis of manuscripts available at different places and on the epigraphic evidences. So far it is believed that the *Brāhmaṇas* of this *śākhā* live mainly in Gujrat, and only a few are seattered in Maharastra. But we find that it had extended from Vijayanagar (Karnataka) in the South to Kashmir in the North. At present the *Śaunkiya* (*Ś*) brāhmaṇa-families are living in Maharastra, Gujrat, Rajasthan, Gwalior (M. P.), Banaras and probably in Kashmir. In the recent past it was popular in a Vast area covering the whole of the Western parts of India.

We know that Sāyaṇa, a native of Vijayanagar, wrote the commentary on *AV* (*Ś*) in the 14th Century, and he was probably not aware of the *AV* (*P*). Now, we have epigraphic proof that in the 15th cent. *A.D.*, *AV* (*Ś*) Brāhmaṇas of the Vijayanagar Empire migrated to Maharastra. D. B. DISKALKAR says, "In West Maharastra, there are living about fifty *AV* Brāhmaṇa families in the Khatav Taluka of Satara District. Interesting information is obtained from some old Marathi records about their colonisation in this region. An *Atharvavedī* Brāhmaṇa named Dada Narasi of the *Bhalandayana gotra* who migrated from Vijayanagar in Karnataka obtained a forman from the Bijapur Sultan in 1386 *A.D.* to populate the Khatav division of the-then Karhad district which had been depopulated during the Durgadevi famine (Selections from the Peshwa Dapthar Vol., 45 Nos 2 and 3). His descendants bearing the surname Kale are still to be found at Malavdi in the Khatav Taluka. He had invited and settled some more *AV* families whose descendants are still there. It is curious to see that although Dada Narasi is said to have hailed from Karnataka, no *Atharvavedī* Brāhmaṇa-families are known to have existed there. There was another colony of the *Atharvavedī* Brāhmaṇas in the village Khed Mahuli, a mile and half to the West of the confluence of Krishna and Venna and three miles to the West of Satara, as evidenced by a stone inscription dated Śaka 1499 found in a Śiva-temple there noted above. These facts lead us to believe that there was a regular emigration of the *AV* and other Brāhmaṇas from Karnataka on the fall of Vijayanagar Empire, and to make themselves popular among the subjects, the Bijapur Muslim rulers sometimes issued grants in their favour.[1] R.G. BHANDARKAR noticed a Vedic school of *AV* Brāhmaṇas in Mahuli.[2] DISKALKAR continues, "Some of the *AV* Brāhmaṇas who had settled in the adjoining village of Chinchner on the bank of the Krishna migrated to Sangli, Ramadurga, Gwalior and Charkhar (in Bundelkhand) at the invitation of the rulers of the places who had maintained at their courts learned Brāhmaṇas of all the four Vedas".[3] S. P. PANDIT collected MSS of *AV* from Keśava Bhat Daji Bhat of Mahuli. According to Pandit he was one of the four good Vaidikas of the *AV* in Deccan.[4] Venkat Bhatji Gore of Sangli is considered by him as the most celebrated *Atharvavedin* in the Deccan. A few years back, V.V. BHIDE of Pune collected a good number of *AV* (*Ś*) MSS from his descendants. These MSS are now deposited in the Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, Pune. Venkat Bhatji's cousin Ganesa Bhat Dada of Mahuli visited Sringeri, and discovered a part of Sāyaṇa's commentary. Two MSS of Sāyaṇa's commentarry on *AV* (*Ś*) were discovered from the Matha at Kudle, Karnataka. On the basis of these two MSS, S. P. PANDIT edited the *AV* (*Ś*) with Sāyaṇabhāṣya. From this we understand the importance of *AV* (*Ś*) Brāhmaṇas of Vijayanagar and Maharastra for the *AV* (*Ś*) tradition. The Hanampur (Dharwār Dist.) inscription of the 16th Century *A. D.*, mentions an *AV* Brāhmaṇa who belonged to the *Gautama Gotra*, *Mādhyandina śākhā*, and practised *Kātyāyana Sūtra* (AR.I.Ep. 1949-50, No. 85 P. 25).[5] The mention of the *Mādhyandina Śākhā* and *Kātyāyana Sūtra* along with the *AV* shows that the *AV* Brāhmaṇas already lost their tradition in that area. This, and the previous information supplied by D. B. DISKALAKAR explain the disappearance of *AV* Brāhmaṇas in Karnataka. Now, coming to Gujrat, the home land of the *Śaunakīya* Brāhmaṇas, we find that they are still living

in Baroda and the Saursatra regions, pursuing their tradition,though owing to the influence of modern life the number of ritualists are decreasing day by day. In the recent times V. RAGHAVAN, under the good offices of H.H. *Śaṁ*karācārya of Dvārakā, arranged a tape-recording of the *AV* (*Ś*) from the Kaṇṭhapaṭhins of Gujrat.[6] Now-a-days *AV* Brāhmaṇas are found at Bhavanagar and Junagadh. in Saurastra and at Sinore, Lunavada and Karnali near Baroda.[7] It is interesting to note that plates are discovered from Bhavanagar (623 *A.D.*) and Lunavada (76 *A.D.*) where *AV* Brāhmaṇas were granted lands by the Kings[8]. From these we can safely conclude that *AV* Brāhmaṇas have been living in these areas at least from 7th Century *A.D.*

There are some *AV* Brāhmaṇas also in Rajasthan (formerly Rajputana). A manuscript of *AV* is there in the Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute collected from Sadasukha Sukla of Jayanagar. One of the MSS of *AV* used by S. P. PANDIT for his edition was written by one Giridhar OJHA in Surapur near Jodhpur. WILSON has seen also some *AV* Brāhmaṇas in Rajasthan.[9]

At Gwalior (M.P.), a few *AV* (*Ś*) Brāhmaṇas are living. D. B. DISKALKAR knew a *Śaunakīya* Brāhmaṇa named Vishnubhat of that place.[10] In recent times late H. R. DIWEKAR collected a copy of Keśava's Paddhati from the *AV* Brāhmaṇa family of late Ganeshabhatta Dada Gore.[11]

In Banaras some *AV* (*Ś*) Brāhmaṇa families are there. DIWEKAR procured a copy of Keśava's Paddhati from an *Atharvavedin* Pandit Narayanabhatji Ratate of Banaras.[12] Late. V. RAGHAVAN informs that two *Atharvavedins*, Bhavani Sankar Dwivedi and his son Mohanlal Dwivedi lived in that place.[13] H.T. COLEBROOKE[14] and F. Otto SCHRADER[15] Procured MSS of 52 *AV Upaniṣads* from Banaras. Through ages Banaras has been the meeting place of the Brāhmaṇas of all the Vedas. Some *AV* (*Ś*) Brāhmaṇas have settled there.

Some scholars think that some Paippalādins were living in Kashmir. I think that not only Paippalādins but also Śaunakīyas were living there. We find about twenty MSS of *AV Saṁhitā* deposited in the Raghunath Temple Library of Jammu.[16] Wherefrom were they procured ? It is perhaps one of the largest collections of the MSS of the *AV* (*Ś*). MSS of the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, *Kauśika Sūtra*, Keśava's *Paddhati*, *Sarvānukramaṇī*, *AV Upaniṣads etc.* are deposited here. We see that a good number of MSS of Nārāyāṇa's Commentaries on 52 *AV Upaniṣads* are deposited here. Here two rare MSS of the Commentary of Nārāyaṇa on the *Varadottaratāpinī* (Dvitīyopaniṣad) are available. Moreover, K. V. HUGEL says that the Atharvavedins were living in Kashmir in the beginning of the 19th century *A.D.*[17] F. Otto SCHRADER in the Introduction to his Critical edition of the *Sāmānyavedānta Upaniṣads* informs us that he has collected the MSS of 52 *AV Upaniṣads* from one Brāhmaṇa Sahaja Bhatta of Śrinagar.

my researches on *AV Upaniṣads*, I know that the MSS of 52 *AV Upaniṣads* are current among the *Śaunakīya Atharvavedins*. So I think that Sahaja Bhatta must have been a *Śaunakīya Atharvavedin*. Hence I presume that some *Śaunakīya Atharvavedins* were living in Kashmir and some may still be found if proper search is made.

The above facts indicate the circulation of the *Śaunakaśākhā* at present in the Western parts of India and Kashmir.

The Paippalāda Śākhā :

The discovery of the birch-bark MS of the *Paippalāda Śākhā* in Kashmir was an epoch-making event in Oriental Studies. But it is known that the MS is very defective, and the first folio is missing. Several other folios are lost or damaged. The MS is corrupt in many places. So efforts were made to find out more MSS but the attempts became futile. In 1957, D.M. Bhattacharyya surprised the scholarly world by discovering *AV (P) Brāhmaṇas* in Orissa. He collected the MSS of *Paippalāda śākhā* but died after editing *AV (P) Saṁhitā* up to the 4th *Kāṇḍa* only. The scholarly world will remain grateful to the memory of this erudite scholar for his great discovery. Under accidental circumstances I started my research on *Paippalāda Atharvavedins* of Orissa. By now I have completed research on the *Upaniṣad* tradition prevalent in *Paippalāda* as well as *Śaunaka śākhās* of *AV*. Through my intensive search for *Paippalāda* MSS, I came to know that hundreds of *Paippalādins* live in different parts of Orissa, Bihar and West Bengal covering a vast area and MSS of the *Paippalāda* literature are available. So far I have found *Paippalādins* in six districts of Orissa *i. e.* Ganjam, Puri, Cuttack, Balasore, Mayurbhanj and Keonjhar; Singbhum district of Bihar and Midnapur district of West Bengal. I also collected MSS of different texts of the *Paippalāda*-tradition. All the *Paippalādins* of Eastern India are Oriya-speaking people. Their texts are written in Oriya-script on palm-leaves. They live in villages. The MSS were written by the ancesters of the present possessors. At present no one writes on palm-leaves. The old MSS of*AV (P)* are fast disappearing due to the ignorance of the owners and due to natural causes. It is difficult to collect MSS from the *Paippalādins*. They conceal them if an outsider makes an approach. They prefer to let them rust than to give them to an outsider. In spite of various types of difficulties, I am able to acquire MSS of the *Paippalāda śākhā*.

In the medieval period also the *Paippalāda Brāhmaṇas* were living in Bengal and Orissa. We find epigraphic proof for it. In the Belva (Dinajpur district of Bangladesh (plates of 1065 *A. D.* and in the Manhainagar (Pobna district of Bangladesh) plates of King Laxmanasena (12th century) the donlors are mentioned as *Pappalāda Brāhmaṇas*. Two other epigraphic records indicate the presence of the *AV Brāhmaṇas* in Orissa. The grants of the Somavaṁśi kings of Orissa dated 674 *A. D.* (E. I. 27,116) and the Neulpur grant of Śubhākaradeva dated 9th Century *A. D.*, show that *AV*

Brāhmaṇas were living in Orissa at that time.[18] Though their *śākhā* is not mentioned, I think that they were *Paippalādins*. In those areas the *Paippalādins* are living even at present.

Now coming to Kashmir, once considered as the home-land of the *Paippalādins*, we have no definite proof of the existence of *AV (P) Brāhmaṇas* there. Only we have some indications. ROTH thinks that there were some in Kashmir. K. C. CHATTOPADHYAYA in his presidential address in the Vedic section of Ninth A.I.O.C. says, "I learn from a friend much interested in Vedic studies, who had been in Kashmir that there are still Vaidikas of the *Paippalāda* school in the land".[19] One thing to be noted is that two more copies of the Tubinqen MS of *AV* (*P*) are available in the libraries of R.A.S., Bombay and India Office Library, London. The Bombay MS was copied in Kashmir in Saṁvat 1926 (1870 *A. D.*) before the Tubinqen MS was sent to ROTH. Similarly 90 MS must have been written earlier. Some *Paippalādins* might have copied them. They may be living even now in some remote areas beyond the notice of scholars.

Regarding the presence of the *Paippalādins* in other areas we have some indirect proofs. In modern times we hear some *AV* Brāhmaṇas of Gujrat and Maharastra claiming themselves *Paippalādins* but read the *Śaunaka* texts. D. M. BHATTACHARYYA[20] cited some such cases. He says that late pandit Hiralal PANCHOLI of Tejpal Sanskrit College, Bombay was a Gujrat Brāhmaṇa of the *Paippalāda śākhā*. He further says that he met an *atharvavedin* at Ahmedabad in 1961, who thinks himself a *Paippalādin* but recites the *Śaunaka mantras*. He quotes D. B. DISKALKAR who had seen some *AV Brāhmaṇas* of Maharastra Calling themselves *Śaunakīya Paippalādins*. G. BUHLER as quoted by SHROEDER[21] had seen some such persons in Kathiawad, Gujrat believing themselves *Paippalādins* but reading the Śaunaka texts. In recent times S.S. BAHULKAR[22] has come to know of the existence of such Brāhmaṇas in Gujrat from one Pandit Vasudeva Pancholi of the *Ā*tharvaṇa Pāṭhaśālā at Sinore. Two inscriptions indicate that there were some *Paippalādins* in Western India in the medieval period. The Vasim (in Vidarbha) plates of the Vakataka king Vindhyasakti II of 4th century *A.D.* mention *Brāhmaṇas* of this *śākhā*. In the Kaira (Gujrat) plates of the Gurjara King Dadda II of 5th Century *A.D.* one *Paippalāda Brāhmaṇa*[23] received land-grants along with Brāhmaṇas of other Vedas.

From the above information we conclude that *Paippalādins* were there in Gujrat and Maharastra in Olden days but they lost their tradition because of the presence of overwhelming number of *Śaunakīya Brāhmaṇas* in these areas. Now some of them retain the faint memory of their past. At present the *Paippalāda*-tradition is found in Eastern India. There may be some in Kashmir.

The Devadarśī śākhā :

This is one of the nine schools of *AV* mentioned earlier. Only one *Upaniṣad* of this *śākhā* is found in *AV Upaniṣad* collections. It is the *Tripādvibhūtimahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* of the *Muktikā*-tradition. The name *Devadarśī* occurs in the body of this text and in the colophons of the MSS of the same text in the *Paippalāda* tradition. This *śākhā* seems to have been very popular in the days of yore. The name found mentioned in *AV Pariśiṣṭa* 49 (*Devadarśaḥ*), *Śaunakīya Caraṇavyūha* (Kunakhi Vedadaśśī) by Sāyaṇa (Vedadarśaḥ) in *Kātyāyana Pariśiṣṭa daśakam* (Vedasparśā) *Śrīmadbhāgavata Purāṇa* (Vedasparśa) and *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (Devadarśa) *etc.* The variant names of it found in various texts are — *Devadarśa, Kunakhī, Vedasparśa, Vedadarśī Vedadarśa, Devarṣī, Divadarśa* and *Devadarśī*. Since among these variants the name Devadarśī is found in its only available text; in the *Paippalāda*-tradition and in *Kauśika Sūtra* 85.7, I think that the correct name should be *Devadarśī*. *Devadarśa* might have been the promulgater of this *śākhā*.

It is interesting to know that the *Tripādvibhūtimahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* of this *śākhā* is included in the 108 *Upaniṣads* of the *Muktikā*-tradition whereas the famed *Mahanārayaṇa* or *Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad*, the 10th *Āraṇyaka* of the *Taittirīya śākhā* is ignored. Still more interesting is the fact that the *Śaunaka AV Upaniṣad* tradition includes the 10th *Āraṇyaka* of the *Taittirīya śākhā* in some of its collections and ignores it completely. One collection of the *Śaunaka*-tradition declares that the *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* (*T. A.*) belongs to the *Paippalāda śākhā*. But in the present *AV* (*P*) MSS, the *Tripādvibhūtimahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* is found whereas the *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* (*T. A.*) is missing. Another thing to be noted is that the colophon of (T.M.U. of *Muktika*-tradition drops the words, "Devadars-*ītyākhyātharvaṇa śākhāyam*" but retains "*Ityātharvaṇa mahānārāyaṇopaniṣadi etc.* indicating its Atharvanic source. In the *Paippalāda* tradition the full colophon "*Devadarśītyākhyāthārvaṇa śākhāyām*" is preserved. In the body of the text of T.M.U. the line indicating its original source remains unimpaired. The relevant line as found in the first *adhyāya* like this —(Mahā Viṣṇu addressing to Brahmā) *Brahman Devadarśityākhyātharvaṇa śākhāyām paramatatvarahasyātharvaṇa mahānārāyaṇopaniṣadi guruśiṣyasamvādaḥ purātanaḥ prasiddhatayā jāgarti*. Here the word *ātharvaṇa* is twice mentioned to emphasise the fact that this text really belongs to *AV* tradition of *Devadarśin*. The Second '*atharvaṇa*' clearly differentiates this *Upaniṣad* from the other *Upaniṣad* of the same name, the M. U. of the *Taittirīya śākhā*. Moreover, the precaution is taken by incorporating the *śākhā*-name in the body of the text to ensure its preservation. This indicates the anxiety of the *Devadarśins* to retain their stamp in their text.

In the *Purāṇas*[24] Devadarśa is a Key figure. He is one of the two disciples of Kabandha. Kabandha taught half of the *AV* to him and the other half to Pathya. Devadarśa again divided his share into four parts and gave them to his four disciples —

Moda, Brahmabala, Pippalāda, Saukyāyani. Pathya divided the other half into three, and gave to his three disciples; Jajali, Kumuda and Śaunaka. Śaunaka again divided his part into two and gave them to his two disciples. In this description of *Purāṇas*, Devadarśa plays a prominent role. He is the head of one line of successors of the *AV* out of the two lines.

Now regarding the area of its circulation D.M. BHATTACHARYYA says, "I now learn from V. Raghavan that Somanatha's Paṇḍitārādhyacarita in Telugu mentions a good many *Vedaśākhās* apparently existing in his own country in his own time, six belonged to the *AV Pippalāda, Śaunaka, Vārantavīya, Brahmavada. Donta* and *Devadarśi*." [25] This indicates that Devadarśi śākhā was known in Telugu areas.

The *Tripad Vibhūtimahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* is included in the *Muktikā*-Collection whose sphere of influence was confined to the Southern region up to the 19th century *A.D.* It is not found in Northern MSS Collections. This indicates the Southern origin of the T.M.U. Some *Paippalādins* of the Ganjam district of Orissa live close to Andhra region. They must have come to know of this Upaniṣad at a later period, and have replaced the *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* of the *Taittirīya śākhā* with the present text of the *AV* tradition proper. That is why we find T. M. U. in the present *Paippalādā* Collections and the M. U. of T. A. as stated in the *Śaunaka* collection. Some scholars who have worked on *Upaniṣad* MSS of the South India think that the T.M. U. is the Andhra recension of the old *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* T. A. So I guess the T. M. U. must have been written by Devadarśins somewhere in Andhra and the compiler of *Muktikā* collection must have belonged to that area. So he could not ignore the native tradition. As a result of this, it was preferred to the older and more important *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* of the *Taittirīya* śākhā.

From the foregoing discussions I conclude that up to a certain period of time *Devadarśī śākhā* was prevalent in the South India possibly in the Andhra region and it had a literature of its own out of which T. M. U. is known to us. If a thorough survey is undertaken more texts belonging to it may be found.

NOTES

1. D. B. DISKALKAR : *Atharvaveda Brāhmaṇas*, P.O. XXVII. P.I.
2. R. G. BHANDARKAR : *I. A.* 1874, P.134
3. D. B. DISKALKAR : *Ibid.*, P.3
4. *AV Saṁhitā* : Introduction.
5. D. B. DISKALKAR : "AV and Epigraphy", *JAS* Bombay, Vol. 34-35
6. V. RAGHAVAN : *The present position of Vedic Recitation and Vedic śākhās* p.p.16-17

7. D. B. Diskalkar : *AV Brāhmaṇas*, P.2
8. D. B. Diskalkar : *AV and Epigraphy*, P.78
9. J. Wilson : *Indian Caste* II P.174
10. D. B. Diskalkar : *AV Brāhmaṇas*, P.4
11. Select writing of H. R. Diwekar P.52, pune, 1976
12. *Ibid.*, P.52
13. V. Raghavan : *op. cit.*, P. 19
14. H. T. Colebrooke : *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol.I, London, 1973, P.84
15. F. Otto. Schrader : *Descriptive Catalogue* (*Upaniṣads*) P.X
16. M. A. Stein : *Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS in the Raghunath Temple Library, Jammu*, P. 13.
17. L. Renou : "The Vedic schools and the Epigraphy." *Siddha Bhāratī*, Part II Hoshiarpur, 1950.P.217
18. D. B. Diskalkar : *Atharva Veda and Epigraphy*, P.75
19. K. C. Chatopadhyaya, IX AIOC., 1940
20. D. M. Bhattacharyya : *AV* (*P*), 1st *Kāṇḍa*, p.XIII
21. L. Schroeder : *Maitrāyaṇi Saṁhitā* I.P.XXIV.n.3
22. S.S.Bahulkar : "*Bhaiṣajyāni* in the *Kauśikasūtra*". Unpublished thesis submitted to the University of Poona, 1977
23. D. B. Diskalkar : *AV and Epigraphy* P.77
24. Ganga Sagar Rai : "Śakhās of the *AV*", *The Purāṇa* XIV. 1972 and R. L. Mitra : *The Gopatha Brahmana*. P.5
25. D. M. Bhattacharyya : *Fundamental themes of the AV*.P.60

A. T. SARANGI, Balangir (Orissa)

UTPĀTA (STARTLING PHENOMENA): AN EXPOSITION AND ANALYSIS

It is a common knowledge that the path of human evolution and revolution is, time and again, vitiated by inroads of an wily Nature. Holocausts and cataclisms like earthquake, conflagration and floods do visit us even today. And, the modern man finds himself completely helpless when so engulfed. The scientists' view in this regard is too popular to be mentioned here. On the other hand, what preoccupies us at the moment are the treatment and measures accorded to the *Utpāta* and *Adbhuta* phenomena in our ancient tradition.

Definition :

An *Utpāta* is generally defined as one which is 'contrary to nature' *Prakṛteranyatvamutpāta.* (*Bṛhatsaṁhitā* 45.1). This is variously explained as *prakṛtiviparyāsa* (reversal of nature) (*samāsasaṁhitā* reading quoted by *Bhaṭṭotpala* on 45.1 of *Br. Saṁhitā* '*Prakṛteranythotpātaḥ*' (different from nature) (Garga quoted in *Adbhutasāgara*, H. D. JHA, Benaras 1905, P. 5), and '*prakṛti-viruddhaḥ*' (in direct apposition to nature) (*Ātharvaṇādbhuta*, quoted in *Adbhutasāgara*, p. 5). All these point to conditions and incidents which may be called unnatural or anatural. Thus an *Utpāta* is one which takes place primarily in contrast to the normal order that is generally observed in a state of nature. Such phenomena clearly violate the natural order like that of an earthquake or the appearance of comet *etc.*

Utpāta and adbhuta :

Such occurences are also known as *adbhuta* and suitable means are prescribed for riddance of their evil influences. Though most of the authors use the terms *abdhutà* and *utpāta* on the same parlour yet, Ballālasena in his monumental treatise *Adbhūtasāgara* (P. 4) incorporates the differences. An *adbhuta* is defined by him as *Abhūtapūrvaṁ yatpūrvam, yatpūrvaṁjāyate'nyathā | tadadbhutamiti proktaṁ naimittaṁ syānnimittajam*) : When the unforeseen manifestsand the manifested ones become different that is to be known as *Adbhuta*; *naimitta* is one which arises from a cause).

Quoting the opinions of ancient authorities like Vṛddhagarga, Bārhaspatya and Parāśara, he tries to drive home the point that *adbhuta* is a generic term which includes *utpāta* as a species. *Adbhuta* is primarily divided into two categories : *nimitta*—that

which has a cause (apparently). Each of these is also two-fold depending on its suspicious character and otherwise. The same author prefers to describe an *utpāta* as one which is both inauspicious and uncaused (*aśubhānimitta*). Thus, an *utpāta* is defined as one which is responsible for premature death and destruction, causing anxiety to worldly people thereby and multiplying their sorrows and suffering. According to the author all other detrimental and pernicious portents also can be included in the category of an *utpāta*. (*Adbhutasāgara* P, 5).

List of Utpātas :

Now it is pertinent that we should acquaint ourselves with some of the phenomena that are described as *utpātas* (startling phenomena).

SLP (Sāmrājyalakṣmīpīṭhikā) (Section X) provides a list of *utpātas* and prescribes that these appearing, the king should perform a grand pacificatory rite to overcome the evil effects of these phenomena. The list, as enumerated, is as follows :

When there is an epidemic (*janamāra*) in the city or State, when there is absolutely no rainfall and consequently people suffer from emaciation (*kṣāma*) and agitation (*kṣobha*), when the capital or kingdom stands under enemy's attack, when draught-animals *viz.* elephants, horses *etc.* suffer from disease or affliction all at a time or start shedding tears, when blood oozes out of trees and creepers of the garden, when idol of gods show movement, laughter and dance or when there is earthquake or bursting of earth's surface, when there is deformity in child-birth in respect of human beings cows, deer and birds, when mushroom (*chatrāka*), bee-hives (*madhu*), and ant-hills (*Valmīka*) appear in the country and ants become winged, when all of a sudden, the forest-trees dry up, when rainbow appears at night and stars during day, when comets are seen in the firmament or when meteor-fall is observed in the sky, when forest animals run into human habitations, without any apparent reason when the natural property of herbs, bushes, creepers and trees get reversed, when towns and cities are affected by sudden conflagration and fire spreads from house to house when twin-fruits appear in plantain and areca-nut (arecacatechu) trees, or when banana plants of the garden bear south-facing fruits, when there is excess or scarce rainfall or when medicinal plants are widely devoid of the sap (*rasa*), when the sun becomes lustreless and there appears a hole in its middle, or when there are meteoric falls and of flames (*dīpikā*) from the sky, when four different suns appear in four different directions falling or when the sun and moon are, surrounded by three haloes (*pariveśatraya*); when lightnings strike in a cloudless sky but there is none at the onset of clouds, when smoke is seen without trace of fire and imaginary astral cities (*gandharva-nagara*) with a variety of forms appear in the sky and stones, blood and ash rain there, when in a similar way is heard weird songs and raining of stones, grass and wood into human habitations, when the spectacle of pairing of crows is repeated and the sight of

white crow becomes not infrequent, when the walls of building and pavilions cave in and finally, when static things like mountains, trees *etc*. appear with mobility and the mobile are deprived of movements, then in all such cases, is to be observed by the prudent ones (*manīṣin*), a great ceremonial ritual of goddess SL obviously, to wear out the bad effects of such incidences. Kings and rulers, being in the central focus of the author, are particularly advised to perform such a ritual as per the prescribed rules (*Kartavyo'tra viśeṣeṇa rājabhiśca yathāvidhi* (SLP 10.4-21).

An analysis of the foregoing list of *Utpātas* in the light of aforesaid definition, seems to lead us to the conclusion that the entire list can safely be interpreted under the *aśubhānimitta* category of *Adbhutasāgara*.

Their nature :

SLP goes further to inform us that whatever may be the nature of an *utpāta*, if variously and widely observed, its effects are considered to be largely portentious. (SLP X 24-25). Explaining the phenomenon of *Utpāta*, an *AV pariśiṣṭa* (No. 64) called *Utpātalakṣaṇa* states that "whenever there is change in the nature, we have to understand it to be an *utpāta*". (*Prakṛteranyathābhāva yatra yatropajāyate|tatra tatra vijānīyāt Sarvamutpātalakṣaṇam*) (64.1.2)

The author of another *pariśiṣṭa* tries to offer explanations as to the occurence of such phenomena. It says that 'the gods send portents which are contrary to nature to warn that men should behave better *cf.* Miss D. J. KOHLBRUGGE, *AV-Pariśiṣṭa uber omina* P.17 quoted by BOLEE, *Ṣaḍviṁśa Brāhmaṇa* (P.104.) Elsewhere, in connection with protents in general, it is said that the gods send portents in order to indicate the future. (*AV-Pariśiṣṭa* No. 72.5.1.3)

"*Sṛjanti|devā divyādbūtāni*
Prāgupasargāt pratibodhanārtham |
Kāryāṇi vighanānı|tathā janānām
Karmākule varṇasamākule ca|." and

"*apācareṇa narāṇām upasargaḥ pāpasañcayāt bhavati saṁsūcayanti divyāntarīkṣabhaumase Utpātāḥ* "

(*Bṛ saṁhitā Utpātādhyāya*. 2)

Depending on their manifestation, these are divided into three distinct classes— those which appear on earth (*Pārthiva*), in the intermediary region (*āntarīkṣa*) and in the sky (divya) and each succeeding one is held to be more powerful than the preceding one, the last category being the strongest.. (*Pārthivam cāntarīkṣaṁ ca divyamutpātalakṣaṇam.* (*AV—Pariśiṣṭa* 64.1.3.). "*Kṣitigaganadivyajāto yathottaraṁ gurutaro bhavati.*" (*Samāsa saṁhitā*.)

Treatment :

Now, as to the treatment of the subject, one observes that some *Utpātas* are quite common to many important texts which broach on the subject. Extarordinary *Utpātas* like earthquake, splitting of earth's surface, devastation caused by fire, falling of meteors and stars, haloes around the Sun and moon, weired sight and sound in the sky, pairing of crows, falling of walls of houses *etc*. are abundantly and commonly dealt with in *Ṣaḍviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*, (*Utpātalakṣaṇa*) (64) and (*Adbhutaśānti* (72) *pariśiṣṭas* of the *AV*, *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, *Adbhutasāgara*, *Mānasollāsa*, *Śivatattvaratanākara* (*STR*) and *SLP*. However, a survey of the contents reveals some differences in the lists of *Utpāta* which are mentioned in different texts.

Differences :

While *SLP* considers *janamāra* (epidemic) as an extraordinary omen of the first order in which the fate of a vast multitude of life is endangered, *Ṣaḍviṁśa Brāhmaṇa* and the rest prefer to drop this altogether The sight of stars during daytime is popularly considered to be ominous even today, but this phenomenon like some others, such as attack by an enemy, excess or scarce rain-fall, afflication, when commonly suffered by animals as a class that manifests in trickles of tears from their eyes *etc*. which are mentioned with greater coucern in S*LP* are conspicuous by their absence in *Ṣaḍviṁśa Brāhmana*. Similarly, glowing of ponds, floating of stones and oozing out of blood from the udders of a cow are a common occurence in *Ṣaḍviṁśa*, *AV-Pariśṭṇa* and *STR*. Likewise, while *Śivatattvaratnākara*, a comparatively recent work (18th century *A. D.*) considers the sight of an owl in the vicinity of a house as indicative of the death of the landlord, others prefer to overlook. In this way, such comparison can be prolonged and differences multiplied. However, this is not withstanding the fact that there are some common devastating phenomena like earthquake *etc*. which are uniformly regarded as portentious by all the authors. Regarding the differences in the various lists we may add here that in face of the vastness of such unnatural phenomena, no list in itself seems to be exhaustive.

Riddance :

It is interesting to note here that the means suggested to get rid of the impact of identical *Utpātas*, also appear to be varied. *SLP* prescribes observance of a great ceremonial ritual of goddess SL to escape the wrath of three different classes of *Utpātas* as a whole. But an *AV pariśiṣṭa* (No. 64) recommends a great pacificatory rite of *Rudra* followed by generous donations which is said to be destroyer of the evils cast by *Utpāta* (*AVP* 64.10.10). On the other hand, in (*Pariśiṣṭa* 67) the author identifies a particular or a host of *Utpātas* with a particula god *viz*. Indra, Agni, Varuṇa *etc*., and recommends a worship in honour of that particular god for riddance from the concerned trouble. For example, we get instructions for the propitiation of Indra with oblations of

clarified butter and *Sthālīpāka* for riddance from the evil that arises out of witnessing a rain-bow at night or at the onset of death of a large number of animals and in the event of a royal dispute *etc*. (67.1.1-8). In a similar way, other texts also prescribe different ways for pacifying the effects of the same *Utpāta*. *Ṣaḍviṁśa Brāhmaṇa* (6.8.2) prescribes a ritual to the wind-god (Vāyu) for having sighted a rain-bow at night, while in such cases. *Śivatattvaratnākara* recommends a sacrifice in honour of Sun, Moon, Rain or the Wind-god (4.11.79-81). And, such difference keeps on occuring owing possibly to the various traditions, these texts follow.

One more innovation with regard to the character of *Utpāta* is provided by *Śivatattvaratnākara*. While viewing the nature of *Utpātas*, it attaches a relative character to these in which it appears to owe its inspiration to ancient authorities like Varāhamihira. For example, *Śivatattvaratnākara* states that one set of *Utpātas* might be ominous with regard to a particular season only. But if observed during different times, they are regarded as auspicious—*Śubhāvahaḥ*. The sight of meteors, blue haloes surrounding the sun and the moon, burning of something other than fire *etc*. which are equally considered bad, become auspicious, if observed during Summer (4.11.33).

In spite of the fact that a variety of means are suggested for obtaining a riddance, there appears to exist a strange agreement amongst different authors with regard to the cause of such unholy incidents. Most of these texts seemingly agree to the divine theory of their orgin/as mentioned earlier that gods when enraged by the wanton behaviour of men, send these to warn them behave better *e.g*. (*A V Pariśiṣṭa* 72.5.3.). And therefore, possibly arises a need to offer rituals to different gods with a prayer to get their blessings in the event of the incidence of an *Utpāta*.

At one place *Śivatattvaratnākara* mentions a curious thing. With certainty, it states that whatever be the nature and descriptions of the manifestation of a startling phenomenon, if it is followed by good rains within a week's time, then the results of such omens are considered to be automatically nullified (4.11.26). Of course, the same text is not explicit as to how the fact that coming of rains there might symbollically stand for the divine bliss that comes down to purge the evil effects. Of course, if there is no rainfall, then should follow the prescribed propitiation of the god or gods concerned. In this connection it may be noted that the mode of riddance is called by the name of *Śānti* (pacification). As an *Utpāta* is the outcome of some *Vikṛti* (transformation) of the natural order, it gives rise to *prakopa* (provocation) whicn stands motif for performance of the pacificatory rites.

Observation :

To conclude it may be said that (i) the definition of *Utpāta* and *adbhuta* as 'contrary to nature' *etc*. appears to he highly exact, and strong rationality seems to be the guiding force behind including the former within the latter. In this direction, *Adbhutasāgara* has indeed done a very systematic work.

(ii) Judging from the vastness of the subject of the 'anatural' it seems certain that full justice could not be done to this subject by any one author as such no list is found to be all-encompassing and exhaustive. The differences in treatment, barring a few general *Utpātas*, seem to owe their origin to the twin factors of time and tradition.

(iii) And lastly, the prescription of propitiation of different god-heads to escape the wrath of the 'unnatural' appears to have stemmed from the belief that the *Utpāta* takes its origin in divine displeasure only. And, therefore, it is necessary to bring about divine grace which, when does not flow naturally, is brought out by propitiation *etc*.

Shantilata TRIPATHY, Bhubaneswar :

KRSNA : THE HERO AND THE GOD

In Indian religion, history and literature Kṛṣṇa is one of the most interesting and eminent characters. He is the prominent hero of Indian mythology. The Epic *Mahābhārata* is of vital importance for the history of Vaisnavism as it is the earliest work which indicates the rise of devotional cult and gives the account of the Vaisnavite divinity Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa, Narāyaṇa and Viṣṇu. On the other hand though Kṛṣṇa is regarded as the incarnation of Viṣṇu, he was born to Vasudeva and Devakī at Mathurā in the family of the Lunar race. His outstanding human character as the friend and counsellor of the Pāṇḍavas as a courageous child of the Gopa made him a hero rather than a God. But his superhuman deeds raised him to the status of the Lord of the Lords.

The *Mahābhārata* and the *Harivaṁśa* narrate Kṛṣṇa as Nārāyaṇa (Supreme Lord), Nara (man), and Narottama (the best among men)[1] . This benedictory verse of *Mbh.* and *Hv.* presents Kṛṣṇa as a god, a man and a hero at the same time. ***Mbh.*** depicts him as a hero, a guide, a philosopher and lastly as the Supreme Lord. ***Hv.*** adds more to Kṛṣṇa a child hero and a romantic hero. ***Hv.*** gradually unfolds the divine nature of Kṛṣṇa. Though at the time of his birth there were some super-natural phenomena, the common mass never realised the divinity of Kṛṣṇa. Neither the parents, Vasudeva and Devakī nor the step parents Nandagopa and yośodā could realise Kṛṣṇa as a divine child. As a baby lovely for his charm and beauty and pranks, Kṛṣṇa could attract all men and women of Gopa, young and old. In course of depicting the exploits of Kṛṣṇa in a very subtle and gradual process, *Hv.* establishes his divinity.

The first exploit, the breaking of the wooden cart by baby Kṛṣṇa surprised the people of Gopa. The second thrilling exploit, the killing of Putanā the demoness in the form of a bird made the people stunned at the sight. The third exploit was the uprooting of the twin *Arjuna* trees. This miraculous achievement of the baby surprised the Cowherds of Gopa. At the time of shifting to Bṛndāvana, Kṛṣṇa created hundreds of wolves from the hairs of his body through his magical power, which created panic in Gopa. When serpent Kāliya was subjugatad by Kṛṣṇa the people of Gopa adored Kṛṣṇa as their

1. *narāyaṇaṁ namaskṛtya naraṁcaiva narottamaṃ|*

saviour in danger. They thought him as the great wonder. When Kṛṣṇa introduced worship of mountain in place of Indra, Kṛṣṇa changed himself to the form of a mountain god and was worshipped by the Cowherds. Through *'Svayambhuva Yoga'* he upheld the mountain and protected the cowherds and cows from disaster when Indra in great fury and anger poured down heavy showers. The cow-herds took shelter under this mountain. At last Indra was defeated and he coronated Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa was worshipped at *Vraja*. Though the cowherds confirmed about the divinity of Kṛṣṇa yet they were in doubt about his particular identity. Further when Kṛṣṇa saved the cowherds by killing the demons Ariṣṭa and Keśin in shape of bull and horse. Nārada eulogised him on behalf of all the divinities. Akrura was the first human being to Visualise Kṛṣṇa as Viṣṇu incarnate. His divinity was confirmed after the death of elephant Kuvalayāpīḍa, Cāṇura, muṣṭika and the tyrant Kaṁsa. From all these exploits and heroic deeds the divinity of Kṛṣṇa was gradually exposed and finally established.

As a child-hero he was the leader of the cowherd boys in play and frolics. By killing the demons who roamed about in different animal forms, Kṛṣṇa brought safety and security to *Vraja*. Since his childhood Kṛṣṇa showed his signs of courage and bravery which suggests his super-human nature.

As a romantic hero there is no comparison with him in Indian history and legend. *Hv.* aptly describes his love for nature. The rainy season with black clouds floating in the sky and the autumn with the clear sky extremely charmed him. Since his childhood he was in search of romantic places for dance and play. In the company of his elder brother Balarāma and the cowherd boys he spent his time in dance, song and play. Moreover the beauty and charm of Kṛṣṇa had a magical effect upon one and all. The cowherd girls were very much attached to him. On moonlit nights as a romantic hero he continued his dance in company with the cowherd maidens. The maidens too full of adoration for Kṛṣṇa sang in praise of his heroic achievements and danced with him. This reference to romantic Kṛṣṇa in *Hv.* has been expounded in detail in *Purāṇa* literature where he is more romantic and sensuous.

In the *Mahābhārata* war the Pāṇḍavas came out victorious only because of Kṛṣṇa's help and support. He appears as a hero of great strength and valour. He was famous in archery and had acquired this art from his preceptor Sandipani.

Kṛṣṇa is compared with the Greek hero Heracles who was worshipped all over Greece. The features in the life of Heracles are similar to the miraculous achievements of Kṛṣṇa. Like Heracles Kṛṣṇa is not the son of a supreme deity. He is the son of a noble Yādava leader and his super-human activities gradually raised him to the status of a divinity. Though his exploits point to his courage and bravery, Yet all of them can be called miraculous achievements which are not possible on this earth for a human being.

Kṛṣṇa is the saviour of mankind in distress. For removing unrighteousness and establishing righteousness he was born on this earth. Kṛṣṇa is the incarnation of Viṣṇu; he is the leader among the gods, naturally the execution of all the plans was entrusted to him. The rescue of the earth is more important for him because the earth is the place of all actions. If unrighteousness prevails on earth, there would be death and disaster. Thus *dharma* is the only effective means which would restore peace and happiness on earth. Kṛṣṇa is *Satyamaya*, *Satyastha* and *Satyavikrama*. That is the reason why the gods implored him to take up the work of removing unrighteousness.[2]

The *Mahābhārata* gives the reasons as to why Kṛṣṇa is worshipped as the supreme Lord though he is a human being. He is adored as a hero as he is the chief warrior of the *Kṣatriya* race. In the *Bhārata* war he vanquished innumerable warriers. Bhīṣma the grand old sire offered his adoration to Kṛṣṇa because of his heroic exploits which brought him allround fame. He is the source of happiness to one and all. In knowledge and wisdom he is superior to the Brahmins. He is superior to the *Kṣatriyas*. *Mbh.* refers to two most outstanding features in the life of Kṛṣṇa *Viz.* the knowledge of the Vedas and their branches and his strength and valour. No body in this world has acquired such distinguished super-human character. Liberality, cleverness, modesty, achievements, bravery, super intelligence, humility, beauty, firmness, contentment and prosperity—all these virtues permanently abide in Kṛṣṇa. For his great accomplishments he is worshipped by the people as a preceptor and father.[3] All these super-human traits of Kṛṣṇa made him the Supreme Lord. He is worshipped as the Origin and and dissolution of the universe. In fact it is from Kṛṣṇa the incarnation of Viṣṇu the entire universe consisting of animate and inanimate beings has sprung into existence. He is the creator, the eternal Lord of all beings.

Thus by the time of the compilation of *Mbh.* Kṛṣṇa's divinity was well established. The Vaisnavite scriptures like the *Mbh.* and *Hv.* establish and try to popularise Vaisnavism. The fundamental aspect of Vaisnavism is the theory of incarnation and the emotional way of worshipping God through devotion. The Epic established a new era by introducing the most popular Vaisnvite religion for the common mass. In course of time the Vedic religion had become the religion of the intellectuals; and it was confined to rituals and sacrifices. It never satisfied the religious aspiration of the common man. In the subsequent development of religious thought the Upaniṣadic doctrines played active part. The doctrine of the upaniṣad is based on God, man and the world. The identification of various gods referred to in the *Vedas* in one and one God into many led to the concept of incarnation (*Avatāra*).

---

2. *Hv.* 62, 28—83.

3. *Mbh.* 2.35, 2—20.

The worship of the unmanifested is difficult for ordinary beings. Worship of personal god is recommended as the easier way open to all—the rich and the poor, weak and the lowly, learned and the ignorant. So the Epic *Mbh.* as the first Vaisnavite scripture suggests the easier method of worshipping the personal god through devotion (***bhakti***). It is a relationship of faith and love to personal god. It is a loving attachment to God where the devotee surrenders himself or herself ro God.

In *Mbh.* Kṛṣṇa is represented both as a historical individual and an incarnation of Viṣṇu. He is identified with the Supreme Lord, the unique principle uniting all the manifold universe. The Hindu thought represents an individual as identical with the universal self. The divinity in Kṛṣṇa made him spiritual. He is not only a hero who was born as a human being and led an earthly life and died, but he is the indwelling spirit and an object of our spiritual consciousness. The essence of Vaisnavism is the concept of incarnation where attempts have been made to personalise the impersonal reality. The infinite God is manifested in finite existence. He is born for the protection of the good, destruction of the evil and establishment of righteousness. All these aspects are vested in Kṛṣṇa the individual human form through which the universal spirit manifests itself:

REFERENCES

1. *Mahābhārata*, Critical Edition, BORI, Poona, 1933-59.
2. Ed. P. L. VAIDYA, *Harivaṁśa*, Critical Edition, Vol. I, BORI Poona, 1969.
3. R. G. BHANDARKAR, *Vaisnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems*, Reprint, Indological Book House, Varanasi 1965.
4. Sukumari BHATTACHARJI, *Indian Theogony*, Firma K. L. MUKHOPADHYAYA, Calcutta, 1978.
5. Charles ELIOT, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, Vol.II, Reprint, London, 1954.
6. G. S. GHURYE, *Gods and Men*, First Edition, Popular Book Depot, Bombay, 1962.
7. J. GONDA, *Aspects of Early Visnuism*, Second Edition, Motilal Banarsidass : Delhi, 1969
8. A. D. PUSALKAR, *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas*, Second Edition, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1963.
9. S. RADHAKRISHNAN, *The Bhagavadgītā*, Fifth Impression, George Allen and Umuin Ltd., London, 1958.
10. R. N. DANDEKAR, *God in Hindu Thought*, Golden Jubilee Vol, 1968, BORI. Poona.
11. Walter RUBEN—*Krishna*, Istanbul, 1943.

APPENDIX—A

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

(For Part II)

SADASHIVA PRAHARAJ
Reader in Sanskrit,
Ravenshaw Evening College,
Cuttack-3.

N. VEEZHINATHAN
professor & Head,
Department of Sanskrit,
University of Madras,
Madras-600005.

HARAMOHAN MISHRA
Lecturer in Sanskrit,
F. M. College,
Balasore.

BIJAYANANDA KAR
Reader,
P.G. Department of Philosophy,
Utkal University,
Bhubaneswar-4.

P. SRIRAMAMURTI
Professor of Sanskrit,
Andhra University,
Waltair,
Visakhapatnam-530003.

K. KRISHNAMOORTHY
'Datta Nivas''
Saptapur,
Dharwad-580001.

P. G. LALYE
Professor of Sanskrit,
Osmania University,
Hyderabad.

SAROJINI BHUYAN
U.G.C. Teacher Fellow,
CASS, Poona University,
Pune-7.

SATYA VRAT SHASTRI
Vice-Chancellor,
Shri Jagannath Sanskrit University,
Puri-752001.

S. D. LADDU
Professor of Sanskrit,
CASS, Poona University,
Pune-7.

R. S. BHATTACHARYA
D 38/8 Houz Katora,
Varanasi (India).

M. D. PANDIT, Reader,
CASS, Poona University,
Pune-7.

RADHAMADHAB DASH, Lecturer,
P.G. Deptt. of Sanskrit,
Utkal University,
Bhubaneswar-4.

K. V. SARMA
Honorary Professor of Sanskrit,
Adyar Library & Research Centre,
Adyar, Madras-600020.

N. GANGADHARAN
Lecturer in Sanakrit,
Madras University,
Madras-5.

VIDHATA MISHRA
University Professor & Head,
Deptt. of Grammar and Linguistics,
K.S.D. Sanskrit University,
Kameshwar Nagar,
Darbhanga-846004 (Bihar).

SITANATH GOSWAMI
63/1 A, Selimpur Lanes,
Calcutta-31.

G. C. TRIPATHI
Principal,
G.N. Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha,
C.S. Azad Park,
Allahabad-2.

J. L. BROCKINGTON
7 Buccleuch Place,
Edinburgh EH 8 9LW
031-6671011
U. K.

SADASHIV A. DANGE
"Girnar"
Gokhale Road,
Mulund East,
Bombay-81.

S. K. LAL, Reader,
CASS, Poona University,
Pune-7.

U. N. DHAL, Reader,
P.G. Deptt. of Sanskrit,
Utkal University,
Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar-4.

S. JENA
Lecturer in Sanskrit,
G.M. Evening College,
Sambalpur.

Smt. BIDYUT LATA RAY
Lecturer in Sanskrit,
Nayagarh College,
Nayagarh, Puri.

K. S. BEHERA
Professor & Head,
P.G. Deptt. of History,
Utkal University,
Bhubaneswar-4.

K. B. TRIPATHI
Retd. Professor of
Oriya & Sanskrit,
Professor Para, Cuttack-3.

N. K. BEHURA
Reader, P. G. Deptt. of Anthropology,
Utkal University, Bhubaneswar-4.

R. C. MISHRA
Lecturer in Sanskrit,
S.C.S. College, Puri.

A. T. SARANGI
Lecturer in Sanskrit,
Bolangir Women's College, Bolangir.

Mrs. S. TRIPATHY
Lecturer in Sanskrit,
S.S. Women's College, Bhubaneswar.

APPENDIX-B

ERRATA

PART—I

Page	*Line*	*Reading in the Edition*	*Correct Reading*
Contents			
(A)	10	गुरं	गुरु
(C)	4	R. T. MISHRA	R. C. MISHRA
Editorial	13	comparision	comparison
ix	13	रद्धा-पश्चान्न	रद्धा पश्चान्न
,,	15	वाण्या-मानन्दितो	वाण्यामानन्दितो
x	2	वाणीपंठेऽमरा	वाणीपीठे सदा
,,	17	परम पूज्याय	परम-पूज्याय
	20	वहुँम्	बहुम्
xiii	10	निवानम्	निधानम्
xvii (omission)	21	name omitted	जयन्त कुमार त्रिपाठी
xviii	4	धृतमरलमृर्त्या	धृतसरलमूर्त्या
xix	16	hertative	hortative
xxii	6-7	Sanyāsin	Sannyāsin
,,	37	दर्शनम्	दर्शनम्
xxiii	26	Ingall	Ingalls
xxv	2	Śaiṅkaraś	Śaṅkara's
xxvi	11	fur	four
xxvii	8	1961.	1961,

PART—II

Page	*Line*	*Reading in the Edition*	*Correct Reading*
1	9	प्रवन्धस्य	प्रबन्धस्य
,,	,,	स्मृतिकरस्य	स्मृतिकारस्य
2	7	हन्तिपद	हन्तिपदं
,,	8	स्मृतिभ्रंशातु	स्मृतिभ्रंशस्तु
,,	11	परिवजयेत्	परिवर्जयेत्
,,	12	तिथय;	तिथय:
,,	13	सर्वतोमात्रेत	सर्वतोभावेन
,,	13	त्यजेदित्यथ:	त्यजेदित्यर्थ:
,,	22	आयुष.	आयुष:
3	10	वस्तु	वस्तु
,,	12	गुरुश्चतुर्दश्यांमपि	गुरुश्चतुर्दश्यामपि
,,	15	वजनीया	वर्जनीया
,,	21	परिवर्जन	परिवर्जनं
,,	22	सकारण	सकारणं
4	1	सुप्रासिद्धो	सुप्रसिद्धो
,,	8	उशनसं	उशना:
4	17	वजयेत्	वर्जयेत्
,,	25	धमशास्त्र-संग्रहान्तगत:	धर्मशास्त्र-संग्रहान्तगत:
5	8	गुरुशिंष्ययोरायु:	गुरुशिष्ययोरायु:
,,	15	नाधीयीताहोरात्र	नाधीयीताहोरात्रं
7	1	हिन्त	हन्ति
,,	13	अनध्यायेष्वभ्य-स्यतो	अनध्यायेष्वभ्य-स्यतो
,,	16	अनध्यायशब्दार्थे	अनध्यायशब्दार्थे
,,	20	पर्वसु	पर्वसु

Page	Line	Reading in the Edition	Correct Reading
8	29	सूत्रटीकाया- मुद्धृत:	सूत्रटीकाया- मुद्धृत:
9	1	हिन्त	हन्ति
10	6	भाव.	भाव:
,,	8	वहूनां	वहूनां
,,	9	विश्वासपूर्वक	विश्रामपूर्वकं
,,	29	जात.	जात:
13	13	सपादक	संपादक:
15	8	आकाङ्क्षा—	आकाङ्क्षा—
,,	20	तैरतैरूरीकरणात	तैस्तैरूरीकरणात्
17	4	शब्दावाच्यत्वे	शब्दावाच्यत्वे
18	6	निरूपायं	निरूपायं
19	20	लक्ष्यत्व	लक्ष्यत्वं
,,	23	परिवर्जिताखिल- जगद्वैत -	परिवर्जिताखिल- जगद्द्वैत —
20	13	सभवतीति	संभवतीति
,,	14	लक्षणान्तेरण	लक्षणान्तरेण
,,	18	असिद्धयादिदोष —	असिद्ध्यादिदोष—
,,	21	एव	एवं
,,	22	व्यदेशदर्शनात्	व्यपदेशदर्शनात्
,,	25	पदान्तरवाच्य	पदान्तरवाच्यं
,,	25	ज्ञेय	ज्ञेयं
,,	26	एव	एवं
21	10	औपनिषदत्व	औपनिषदत्वं
,,	11	शब्दावाच्त्वे	शब्दावाच्यत्वे
,,	17	तीर	तीरं
,,	21	अवाचयपद- मुख्याथस्या—	अवाच्यपद- मुख्यार्थस्या—
,,	25	भेदोऽर्थ ।	भेदोऽर्थ: ।
,,	26	अवाचयमिति	अवाच्यमिति
22	4	संभवत्येवेति	संभवत्येवेति
,,	7	वाच्यत्वात्वा- पत्ति:	वाच्यत्वापत्ति:

Page	Line	Reading in the Edition	Correct Reading
22	7	वाच्याथस्या—	वाच्यार्थस्या—
,,	8	शब्दन	शब्देन
,,	9	वाच्यत्वापत्ति:	वाच्यत्वापत्ति:
,,	13	लक्ष्यशब्दस्य	लक्ष्यशब्दस्य
,,	14	शक्याथ:	शक्यार्थ:
,,	15	लक्ष्यशब्द- बोध्यार्थ:	लक्ष्यशब्दबोध्यार्थ:
,,	24	यद्यत्कम	यद्यत्कर्म
,,	26	शब्दस्य	शब्दस्य
23	5	विशेषा....दिक	विशेषा....दिकं
,,	,,	तद्विशिष्टत्व	तद्विशिष्टत्वं
,,	6	तदाश्रय....भूत	तदाश्रय ...भूतं
,,	8	निर्विशेषत्वादिक	निर्विशेषत्वादिकं
,,	11	ब्रह्मणत्तु	ब्रह्मणस्तु
,,	12	मच्चत्वाधार—	मच्चत्वाधार—
,,	15	घटादिवत	घटादिवत्
,,	27	वाक्या....प्रकृति- प्रत्ययो:	वाक्या ..प्रकृति- प्रत्यययो:
24	2	वाचकत्वाभावो	वाचकत्वाभावो
,,	3	वाक्यान्तर्गतस्यं	वाक्यान्तर्गतस्य
,,	4	अवाच्यत्वेऽपि	अवाचयत्वेऽपि
,,	6	पदाद्यर्थसंसगरूपं	पदाद्यर्थसंसर्गरूपं
,,	15	अशब्दमस्पश—	अशब्दमस्पर्श—
,,	21	भवाति	भवति
25	3	विरोध.	विरोध:
,,	6	इत्यादिस्मृतेञ्च	इत्यादिस्मृतेश्च
,,	,,	परमार्थसदादिपद	परमार्थसदादिपदं
,,	7	कस्यचिद्वाचक	कस्यचिद्वाचकं
,,	18	तद्धधकस्य	तद्बाधकस्य
,,	23	वाच्यार्थसंवन्धि- तया	वाच्यार्थसंबन्धि- तया
,,	25	वाच्यसवन्धित्वेन	वाच्यसंबन्धित्वेन
,,	27	वाच्यार्थसंन्धि- त्वेने	वाच्यार्थसंबन्धि- त्वेन

Page	Line	Reading in the Edition	Correct Reading
25	28	एवोपस्यितमिति	एवोपस्थितमिति
,,	29	शब्दसार्थक्यात	शब्दसार्थक्यात्
26	4	चक्रक	चक्रकं
,,	5	ब्रह्णि	ब्रह्मणि
,,	5	निमित....भावस्य	निमित्त ...भावस्य
,,	10	विशेष्यपर- विशिष्ट —	विशेष्यपर- विशिष्ट –
,,	11	सत्यत्वादि- वैशिष्ट्य—	सत्यत्वादि- वैशिष्ट्य –
,,	11	ब्रह्मण	ब्रह्मण:
,,	12	निर्विशेष- शब्दवाच्यत्व	निर्विशेष- शब्दवाच्यत्वं
,,	13	ब्रह्णि	ब्रह्मणि
,,	16	अवाच्यत्व	अवाच्यत्वं
,,	27	परामर्शमर्हति ।	परामर्शमर्हति ॥
27	3	*Chāndog-yopanisad*	*Chāndog-yopaniṣad*
,,	5	*Saddarśan—*	*Ṣaḍdarśan—*
,,	8	*Taittiriyopa—*	*Taittirīyopa—*
,,	40	*padārthatatt-vanirnaya*	*padārthata-ttvanirṇaya*
29	6	Srī	Śrī
,,	13-14	anttagonistic	antagonistic
31	9	indescribility	indescribability
,,	33	*arthakriyā-samartho*	*arthakriyā-samartha*
,,	37	*Nāiyāyikas*	*Naiyāyikas*
32	27	*philosoph*	*philosophy*
35	1	*Nirvikalpaka*	*Nirvikalpaka*
,,	2	*jnāna*	*jñāna*
,,	7	*jnāna*	*jñāna*
,,	29	*pratyokṣa*	*pratyakṣa*
,,	40	Concestualised	Conceptualised
36	3	*prakāra*	*prakāra*
39	5	can tot	cannot
,,	18	wordly	worldly
,,	19	trancends	transcends
,,	26	occassionally	occasionally
43	26	*Sādhāvanī-karaṇa*	*Sādhāraṇī-karaṇa*
,,	38	enterpriscs	enterprises
45	7	succeeced	succeeded
48	35	thrt	that
49	9	stanzes	stanzas
51	30	masters'	master's
52	10	धर्मसेनोनिबन्ध-नात्	धर्मसेनोर्निबन्ध-नात्
,,	21	निरमांशु	निरमांशु:
,,	24	रौद्रोऽस्य	रौद्रोऽस्यं
57	6	*prasakta... dīrghnisvanāḥ*	*prasakta... dīrghanisvanaḥ*
58	8	*vibhāvanā*	*vibhāvanā*
,,	10	*viśeṣoktī*	*viśeṣokti*
,,	23	af	of
59	13	*Sliṣta*	*Śliṣṭa*
63	1	of	in
,,	7	persuit	pursuit
64	12	matamorphosis	metamorphosis
66	7	*Svayamvara*	*Svayaṁvara*
67	9	addresing	addressing
,,	21	poecision	precision
69	33	*ibid*	*ibid*
70	21-22	*lakṣaṇaikacakṣuska*	*lakṣaikacakṣuska*
71	13	ths	the
72	7	siṣṭa—	śiṣṭa—
74	10	बह्वोऽप—	बह्वोऽप—
,,	17	देवदिग्णशब्द	देवादिग्णशब्दं
,,	22	कोऽरथस्य	कोऽस्य रथस्य
77	22	Bhoṭṭojī	Bhaṭṭojī
82	27	*Yenahaṁ*	*Yenāhaṁ*
83	13	Bhartṛhari	Bharttṛhari

Page	Line	Reading in the Edition	Correct Reading
83	13	(ptj)	(Ptj)
,,	15	Mahābhāṣya-dipikā	*Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā*
,,	,,	Mahābhāṣya	*Mahābhāṣya*
,,	17	candragomin	Candragomin
	19	illustrativelly	illustratively
84	21	*cvyarteṣu*	*cvyartheṣu*
87	27	*upasagaras*	*upasargas*
,,	28	*pulroḥ*	*pūlroḥ*
88	13	authos	authors
92	28	occindental	occidental
94	34	*Śilpaśāstray*	*Śilpaśāstra*
95	3	*śilpā*	*śilpa*
,,	9	*Syapnasāstra*	*Svapnaśāstra*
,,	10	*Sāmudrikasāstra*	*Sāmudrikaśāstra*
,,	,,	*Manovijnāna*	*Manovijñāna*
96	13	rhe	the
,,	17	irrelevent	irrelevant
98	14	rnd	and
103	20	rhe	the
109	1	*Mahābhāratha*	*Mahābhārata*
110	3	बाह्मणो	ब्राह्मणो
111	10	दृशितम्	दर्शितम्
,,	16	दास्य	दास्य
112	1	TRIPATHY	TRIPATHI
,,	29	ग्रन्थम्यास्य	ग्रन्थस्यास्य
113	32	(kaṭakarājavaṁśā —)	(kaṭakarājavaṁśā—
117	21	padestal	pedestal
,,	24	threshhold	threshold
,,	3	*Purāṇa*	*Purāṇa*

Page	Line	Reading in the Edition	Correct Reading
128	12	*prajāyaute*	*prajāyate*
145	36	according	according to
,,	39	beiong	belong
146	4	oi	of
,,	29	*rājāpi*	*rājāpi*
148	5	—*Kṣetra*	—*Kṣetra*
	25	places,	places.
	29	*Taittirīya Saṁhitā*[4]	*Taittirīya Saṁhitā*[4].
154	14	analogus	analogous
155	10	*vedhiḥ*	*vediḥ*
167	2	one	on
	3-4	Evaluation	Evolution
,,	33	antiquatedisan	antiquated is an
178	28	vavious of	various of
,,	32	organization	organization,
179	28	seattered	scattered
182	36	donlors	donors
183	11	Tubinqen	Tubingen
185	12	*Tripad*—	*Tripād*—
,,	36	p.p.	pp.
187	1	(Orissa)	(Orissa) :
	16	apposition	opposition
	24	*abdhuta*	*adbhuta*
,,	25	*Adbhūtasāgara*	*Adbhutasagara*
,,	28	manifestsand	manifests and
189	23	protents	portents
190	4	Extarordinary	Extraordinary
,,	17	aiflication	affliction
,,	19	coucern	concern
,,	22	*AV-Pariśtṭa*	*AV-Pariśiṣṭa*
191	34	whicn	which

— * —